DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 255 131 HE 018 186

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Commission Staff Comments on Equal Educational Opportunity Programs for the 1983-84 Budget. Commission Report 83-22. |
| INSTITUTION | California State Postsecondary Education Commission, Sacramento. |
| PUB DATE | Apr 83 |
| NOTE | 94p.; For a related document, see HE 018 187. |
| AVAILABLE FROM | California Postsecondary Education Commission, 1020 12th Street, Sacramento, CA 95814. |
| PUB TYPE | Reports - Descriptive (141) |
| EDRS PRICE | MF01/PC04 Plus Postage. |
| DESCRIPTORS | Access to Education; Ancillary School Services; Budgets; College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; *Developmental Studies Programs; Economically Disadvantaged; *Educational Opportunities; Ethnic Groups; Financial Support; Higher Education; Low Income Groups; *Minority Groups; Outreach Programs; State Aid; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning; *Student Recruitment; Transitional Programs; Tutoring |
| IDENTIFIERS | *California; *Public Colleges |

ABSTRACT

Recommendations of the California Postsecondary Education Commission on proposed state-funded outreach and support service programs for ethnic minority and low-income postsecondary students are provided, along with descriptive data. With a focus on 1983-1984 budget issues, attention is directed to four types of programs at state institutions: developmental outreach, information outreach, retention, and comprehensive services. The following objectives are used by Commission staff in reviewing existing and proposed outreach and support service programs: to promote the most effective use of resources, to improve services to students, and to expand cooperative efforts by educational institutions. Twelve state-funded programs are reviewed on the basis of these criteria. For 20 programs funded by federal, state, private, and/or educational fees, the following descriptive information is provided: the implementing agent, target group, year started, program objectives, program services, funding source, number of clients served and funding in 1982-1983, and evaluation provisions. Also considered are policy issues relevant to the funding of equal educational opportunity programs. Detailed information about specific programs is appended, including objectives, funding history, and numbers served. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED255131

# COMMISSION STAFF COMMENTS ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS FOR THE 1983-84 BUDGET

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
California Postsecondary Educ Comm
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

HE018186

## CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION

*The California Postsecondary Education Commission was created by the Legislature and the Governor in 1974 as the successor to the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education in order to coordinate and plan for education in California beyond high school. As a state agency, the Commission is responsible for assuring that the State's resources for postsecondary education are utilized effectively and efficiently; for promoting diversity, innovation, and responsiveness to the needs of students and society; and for advising the Legislature and the Governor on statewide educational policy and funding.*

*The Commission consists of 15 members. Nine represent the general public, with three each appointed by the Speaker of the Assembly, the Senate Rules Committee, and the Governor. The other six represent the major educational systems of the State.*

*The Commission holds regular public meetings throughout the year at which it takes action on staff studies and adopts positions on legislative proposals affecting postsecondary education. Further information about the Commission, its meetings, its staff, and its other publications may be obtained from the Commission offices at 1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814; telephone (916) 445-7933.*



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

COMMISSION STAFF COMMENTS ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS FOR THE 1983-84 BUDGET

CALIFORNIA POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION COMMISSION
1020 Twelfth Street, Sacramento, California 95814



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Commission Report 83-22

April 1983



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CONTENTS


| | Page |
|---|---|
| OVERVIEW | 1 |
| CRITERIA USED IN THE REVIEW OF PROGRAMS | 2 |
| POLICY ISSUES | 13 |
| FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS | 21 |
| RECOMMENDATIONS | 27 |
| APPENDIX A: Summary of Existing Outreach and Support Service Programs | 31 |
| APPENDIX B: Summary of Important Non-State Funded Outreach and Support Service Programs | 85 |


BEST COPY AVAILABLE

# COMMISSION STAFF COMMENTS ON EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS FOR THE 1983-84 BUDGET

This third annual Commission staff report is prepared in response to requests from the Legislature for comments and recommendations on all existing and proposed State-funded outreach and support service programs for ethnic minority and low-income students in all segments of public postsecondary education. The analysis presented below is in summary format and focused on issues relating to the 1983-84 Budget. In the preparation of these comments and recommendations, Commission staff used the policies and principles presented in two other Commission reports entitled Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part III (March 1980) and Part IV (March 1982), which provide detailed analyses of efforts within California to expand educational opportunities.

## OVERVIEW

The several outreach and support service programs operating in California can be classified on the basis of their primary objectives and purposes. Four different types of programs can be distinguished:

1. Developmental Outreach: Programs of this type seek to increase the academic aspirations and/or improve the academic preparation of students either (1) in junior and senior high school so that they complete the necessary college-preparatory courses and have the necessary academic skills to succeed in college, or (2) in two-year colleges so that they can make the transition to four-year colleges after completing their educational objectives at the two-year institution.

2. Informational Outreach: Programs of this type seek either to (1) provide information about financial assistance and postsecondary alternatives generally in order to facilitate admission into college, or (2) provide information about a specific college in order to facilitate recruitment into that college.

3. Retention: Programs of this type seek to strengthen the academic skills of students enrolled in college so that the student can successfully complete his/her academic or vocational program in a timely fashion.

4. Comprehensive Services: Programs of this type provide a broad spectrum of services including outreach, orientation, admissions, and retention in order to increase the number of target students who enroll in and graduate from college programs.

All three public segments of postsecondary education, as well as the State Department of Education, administer programs designed to increase the number of ethnic minority and low-income students who enroll in and graduate from college. These programs are funded through allocations by the federal and State governments, as well as through student fees in the University of



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

California. State General Fund support is also provided to two intersegmental programs: Cal-SOAP and MESA. Funding levels in 1982-83 for these 17 programs, summarized in Table 1, totaled $32.1 million in State funds, $10.7 million in federal funds, and $3.5 million in student fee revenue. Tables 2 through 5 include a summary of descriptive information about each of these programs. This information included in the tables and provided in more detail in the appendices is in response to the following questions:

1. Who is the agent responsible for program implementation?
2. What is the target group served by the program?
3. When was the program started?
4. What are the specific objectives of the program?
5. What specific methods or services are being used to achieve these objectives?
6. What has been the amount of funding during 1982-83?
7. What has been the source of funding?
8. How many people are being served by the program during 1982-83?
9. Who has the responsibility for evaluating the relative success of the program?

## CRITERIA USED IN THE REVIEW OF PROGRAMS

Commission staff have used the following criteria in reviewing and making recommendations about existing and proposed State-funded outreach and support service programs for ethnic minority and low-income students. These criteria reflect the concerns of Commission staff to (1) promote the most effective use of resources, (2) improve services to students, and (3) expand cooperative efforts by educational institutions. In addition, they reflect an awareness of the State's current financial crisis which requires that available funds for equal educational opportunity efforts be directed to those efforts which are the most cost-effective in achieving the State's goals of increased college enrollment and graduation rates by ethnic minority and low-income students. In short, these criteria include the elements which should exist in a successful and efficient program.

- Objectives

  a. The program administrators have developed and publicized specific, measurable program objectives, against which judgments about relative program success can be made.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*TABLE 1 Summary of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs, 1982-83*

| Type of Program | Name of Program | State General Fund | Student Fee | Federal Funds | Total Funds |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Developmental Outreach | UC Early Outreach | $1,800,000 | $600,000 | | |
| | UC Academic Enrichment | 200,000 | | | |
| | SDE Demonstration Program in Reading and Mathematics | 3,558,000 | | | |
| | MESA | 500,000 | | | |
| | Upward Bound | | | | |
| | CCC Student Affirmative Action Transition Projects | 222,000 | | $5,306,602 | |
| Subtotals | | $6,280,000 | $600,000 | $5,306,602 | $12,186,602 |
| Informational Outreach | UC Immediate Outreach | $ 450,000 | $150,000 | | |
| | Cal-SOAP | 275,225 | | | |
| | Educational Opportunity Centers | | | $ 627,287 | |
| | Talent Search | | | $1,239,990 | |
| Subtotals | | $ 725,225 | $150,000 | $1,867,277 | $ 2,742,502 |
| Retention Efforts | UC Student Affirmative Action Support Services | $1,053,000 | $350,000 | | |
| | Special Services for Disadvantaged Students | | | $3,520,000 | |
| | University Minority Engineering Program | 700,000 | | | |
| Subtotals | | $1,753,000 | $350,000 | $3,520,000 | $5,623,000 |
| Comprehensive Service Efforts | UC Educational Opportunity Program* | | $2,400,000 | | |
| | CSU Core Student Affirmative Action | $2,472,000 | | | |
| | CSU Educational Opportunity Program* | $6,903,000 | | | |
| | CCC Extended Opportunity Programs and Services* | $14,435,200 | | | |
| Subtotals | | $23,810,200 | $2,400,000 | -0- | $26,210,200 |
| TOTAL | | $32,568,425 | $3,500,000 | $10,693,879 | $46,762,304 |

*The funding level shown does not include funding appropriated for financial assistance grants for students.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 2 *Developmental Outreach Type of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs in California, 1982-83*

| Name of Program | Implementing Agency | Target Group | Year Started | Program Objectives |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic Enrichment Program | University of California campuses at Berkeley, Davis, Irvine, and Santa Barbara | Ethnic minorities in the 10th and 11th grades at 25 high schools | 1979 | To increase the enrollment of ethnic minority students in postsecondary education through the involvement of University faculty in developmental enrichment programs for secondary schools |
| Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics | State Department of Education | Low-income junior high school students | 1969 | To develop above-average competency in basic skills among students in grades 7-9, living in areas of concentrated poverty |
| Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) | Collection of eighteen colleges working in sixteen centers serving one hundred thirty high schools | Underrepresented minorities in 9th - 12th grades | 1970 | To increase number of minorities with academic background necessary to pursue a university or college education in a math-based field |
| University and College Opportunity Program | State Department of Education, working with six secondary school projects | Ethnic minority and/or low-income students in high school | 1979 | To increase the number of ethnic minority students who are eligible for and enroll in a four-year college |
| University of California Early Outreach Program | University of California | Ethnic minorities in grades 8 through 11, at approximately 191 junior high schools and 140 high schools | Partnership--1976 Partners--1978 | To increase the number of low-income and/or ethnic minority students who are eligible to enroll in public four-year colleges. |
| Upward Bound Projects | Thirty-three projects involving individual colleges, universities, and community agencies | Low-income high school students and veterans | 1964 | To increase the number of low-income students who gain admission to college and successfully complete their education |
| Community College Student Affirmative Action Transition Project | California Community Colleges | Low-income, ethnic minority or handicapped students | 1981 | To increase the transfer rate of low-income, underrepresented students (ethnic minorities and persons with disabilities) from two-year to four-year colleges |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| Program Services | 1982-83 Funding | Funding Source | Number of Clients Served 1982-83 | Evaluation Component |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Summer academic enrichment projects<br>Academic advising<br>Field trips and campus tours<br>Tutorial service<br>Scholarship incentive awards<br>Summer residential programs | approx. $200,000 | State General Fund | 3?? | The University has the responsibility for program evaluation, and some impact data are available. |
| Individualized instruction<br>Specially designed curricula and materials<br>Learning centers or laboratories | $3,558,000 | State General Fund | 9,000 (approx.) | Evaluation reviews prepared by Department of Education and the Legislative Budget Committee. Impact data are available annually. |
| Tutoring<br>Academic and career counseling<br>Field trips<br>Summer enrichment and employment programs<br>Scholarship incentive awards | $1,044,000 | 43% State General Fund<br>57% Private industry and private foundations | 2,578 | The MESA staff makes annual reports to its governing board about the number of students served at each Center. In addition, an outside evaluation of MESA has been completed by the Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA, through funds provided by the Hewlett Foundation. |
| Tutoring<br>Academic and career counseling<br>Field trips | | Federal government | -0- | This program is in its final year, with 2 projects identified as exemplary being disseminated throughout the State. |
| Academic Advising Role model presentations<br>College and university visits<br>Dissemination of printed material<br>Parent meetings<br>Field trips<br>Summer enrichment programs<br>Tutorial services<br>Counseling on financial aid, college, and careers | $2,303,000 | 75% State General Fund<br>25% Educational Fees | 8,203 junior high school students and 9,738 senior high school students | The University has the responsibility for program evaluation, and some impact data are available. |
| Individualized instruction<br>Tutoring<br>Cultural enrichment activities<br>Counseling<br>Summer enrichment programs | $5,306,602 | Federal government | 3,000 | The federal government has responsibility for program evaluation and a national study has been completed. However, no impact data for California programs are available. |
| Work internship experience<br>Concurrent enrollment at a two-year and four-year college<br>Counseling<br>Admissions and financial aid assistance | $222,000 | State General Fund | 400 | Commission is to report to the Legislature by Dec. 31, 1983, on the effectiveness of these projects. |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 3 Informational Outreach Type of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs in California, 1982-83

| Name of Program | Implementing Agent | Target Group | Year Started | Program Objectives |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP) | Five Consortia of two- and four-year colleges working with secondary schools | Low-income, ethnic minority students in secondary schools and Community Colleges | 1979 | To expand postsecondary opportunities for low-income high school students<br><br>To assist low-income Community College students transfer to four-year institutions |
| Educational Opportunity Centers | One center in Fresno (Fresno Mobile Education Guidance, Inc.); one in Los Angeles (UCLA Extension) | Low-income persons at least 19 years of age, who reside within the targeted geographic area | 1973 | To serve as clearinghouses for information about postsecondary educational opportunities and to coordinate interinstitutional efforts in counseling and recruitment |
| State University Core Student Affirmative Action (outreach component) | All State University campuses | Ethnic minorities in senior high school | 1979 | To increase the number of ethnic minority students who gain admission to college and successfully complete their education |
| University Immediate Outreach | All University of California campuses | Ethnic minorities in the 12th grade and in the Community Colleges | 1978 | To increase the number of underrepresented ethnic minority and low-income students who apply and enroll in the University of California |
| Talent Search Projects | Fourteen projects operated by community agencies and colleges | Low-income youth between ages 14 and 27 | 1964 | To increase the number of low-income youths attending college<br><br>To reduce the high school dropout rate<br><br>To increase the number of dropouts who return to educational programs |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| Program Services | 1982-83 Funding | Funding Source | Number of Clients Served 1982-83 | Evaluation Component |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Postsecondary education and financial aid advisement<br>Tutoring<br>Coordinated information dissemination<br>Summer residential programs<br>Field trips<br>Skill Development Seminars<br>Career Seminars | $ 700,925 | $275,225 from State General Fund and $425,700 from Institutional Matching Funds | Approx. 10,000 students receive counseling and tutoring services and/or benefit from coordinated information dissemination | The California Postsecondary Education Commission has responsibility for evaluation; the final evaluation was published in February 1983. |
| Provide information about financial and academic assistance<br>Provide assistance in preparing application for admission<br>Provide counseling and tutorial assistance | $ 627,287 | Federal government | 15,000 | Federal government has responsibility for program evaluation |
| Cultural events<br>Home visits with parents<br>Use of bilingual materials<br>Counseling<br>Campus tours<br>Academic advising | $ 865,000 (for outreach component only) | 100% State General Fund | 41,913 | Commission and CSU cooperatively develop and implement evaluation framework; two reports are currently available; final report is due in Winter 1983. |
| Campus visits<br>High school visits<br>Publications<br>Cultural activities<br>Admissions counseling sessions<br>Peer counseling | $ 596,000 | 75% State General Fund<br>25% Educational Fees | Data not available | The University has the responsibility for program evaluation. |
| Counseling<br>Career Planning<br>Field trips | $1,239,990 | Federal government | 24,000 | The federal government has responsibility for program evaluation, but no reports specific to California have been provided. |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*TABLE 4 Retention Type of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs in California, 1982-83*

| Name of Program | Implementing Agent | Target Group | Year Started | Program Objectives |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Special Services for Disadvantaged Students | Twenty-nine projects at two- and four-year colleges, and one project at a community agency | Low-income and/or educationally, socially, culturally, or physically handicapped "disadvantaged" students | 1969 | To increase the retention rate of students who have academic potential but who are hindered because of their educational, cultural, or economic background or physical disabilities |
| State University Core Student Affirmative Action (retention component) | All State University campuses | Ethnic minority students enrolling at CSU campuses | 1979 | To increase the number of ethnic minority students who successfully complete their college education |
| University of California Student Affirmative Action Support Services | All University campuses | Ethnic minority and low-income students enrolled at UC campuses | 1976 | To increase the number of ethnic minority and low-income students who successfully complete their college education |
| University Minority Engineering Program | 14 projects at selected four-year public and independent universities | Underrepresented minority students enrolled in engineering and computer science baccalaureate programs | 1982 | To increase the number of underrepresented minority students who graduate with B.S. degrees in engineering, computer science, and related fields |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| Program Services | 1982-83 Funding | Funding Source | Number of Clients Served 1982-83 | Evaluation Component |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Academic and career counseling<br>Tutoring<br>Study skills workshops | $3,520,000 | Federal government | 11,000 | The Systems Development Corporation has contracted to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of the program on a nationwide basis. The evaluation should be published within the next few months. |
| Diagnostic testing<br>Economic counseling<br>Counseling and advising<br>Cultural programs<br>Bilingual information sharing | $1,607,000 (for retention and educational enhancement) | State General Fund | 10,993 | Commission and CSU cooperatively develop and implement evaluation framework; two reports are currently available; final comprehensive report is due in Winter 1983. |
| Summer transitional programs<br>Counseling and advising on both academic and personal matters<br>Learning skills assistance<br>Tutoring and instructional assistance<br>Career planning and advising on graduate and professional schools | $1,406,000 | 75% State General Fund<br>25% Educational Fees | Unduplicated number not available | The University has the responsibility for program evaluation |
| First year transition support<br>Professional counseling<br>Student Study Center<br>Career Development and Summer Jobs<br>Financial Aid and Scholarship Assistance | $1,390,000 | 50% State General Fund<br>50% Private Sources | 2,800 students are projected for 1982-83 | The MESA statewide office will gather data to assess program impact. |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*TABLE 5 Comprehensive Services Type of Equal Educational Opportunity Programs in California, 1982-83*

| Name of Program | Implementing Agent | Target Group | Year Started | Program Objectives |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Educational Opportunity Program | California State University | Low-income and minority students with "disadvantaged" background | 1969 | To increase the enrollment and retention rate of low-income, educationally disadvantaged ethnic minority students who may not meet the regular admission criteria at CSU |
| Educational Opportunity Program | University of California | Low-income, ethnic minority students who need academic support services | 1964 | To increase the enrollment and retention rate of low-income, ethnic minority students attending the University |
| Extended Opportunity Programs and Services | California Community Colleges | Low-income students | 1969 | To increase the enrollment and retention rate of people handicapped by language, social, and/or economic disadvantages |

*The 1982-83 funding level shown for the EOP/S programs does not include funding appropriated for financial assistance grants for students.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| Program Services | 1982-83 Funding | Funding Source | Number of Clients Served 1982-83 | Evaluation Component |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Financial assistance<br>Tutoring<br>Counseling<br>Academic advising<br>Summer orientation sessions<br>Diagnostic testing | $ 6,903,000* | State General Fund | Approx. 17,000 students, with 30,000 other students receiving admissions services | The systemwide office completed a limited program evaluation in 1978. Campus annual reports and systemwide data base serve as a basis for evaluating academic achievement of the students. |
| Financial assistance<br>Tutoring<br>Counseling<br>Academic advising<br>Summer orientation sessions | $ 2,400,000* | Registration fee revenues | Approx. 10,000 students | No evaluation has been planned. |
| Financial assistance<br>Tutoring<br>Counseling<br>Academic advising<br>Basic skills instruction<br>Career planning and job placement | $14,435,188* | State General Fund | Approx. 68,000 | The Chancellor's Office of the Community Colleges has the responsibility for program evaluation. In 1976, a program evaluation was prepared by the Educational and Training Institute. During the past year, the Chancellor's Office has established a process to update and improve evaluation strategies for EOPS in the 1980s. |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

b. For those programs which have been in operation for three or more years, data are available to demonstrate that the program is successful in achieving its objectives.

c. The program includes a comprehensive data management component, so that information is routinely gathered and reported about the number and characteristics of the clients served, the services provided, and the impact of these services.

- Incentives

The systemwide office distributes program funds to the campuses through a process which recognizes and rewards institutional effectiveness in achieving the objectives of the program.

- Continuity

The outreach program provides, wherever possible, a continuity of services, so that students experience the influence of the program over a period of years, rather than just in one summer, in one classroom, or from just one teacher.

- Interinstitutional Cooperation

Developmental and informational outreach services offered to secondary school and Community College students are operated through an explicit cooperative interinstitutional mode, with these services complementing the counseling services offered by the host campus.

- Coordination of Support Services

The support service component of the equal educational opportunity program has a mechanism to assure effective coordination with similar support service programs on the same campus.

- Involvement of Non-College Personnel

The program utilizes services and resources available from the private sector as well as the involvement of non-college personnel such as parents, community groups, and local government.

- Careers

The program involves an explicit linkage between academic studies and subsequent career opportunities for the target students.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The 12 State-funded programs included in this report are reviewed on the basis of these criteria in Table 6. A more extensive discussion of this review is included for each program in the appendix. In those cases where sufficient data are not available to make an assessment, the phrase "not clear" has been used. In addition, certain criteria are not applicable (N/A) to certain programs.

## POLICY ISSUES

There are several policy issues related to the funding of equal educational opportunity programs which should be considered by the Legislature during its review of the 1983-84 Budget. The Legislative Analyst's Office, in its report on the 1983-84 Budget has identified some of these issues:

1. What is the most effective method to provide developmental and enrichment services to ethnic minority and low-income secondary school students? Secondary school educators should have the leadership role in preparing secondary school students for college. However, new initiatives are needed involving active, cooperative efforts by secondary and postsecondary staff to strengthen college preparatory curricula and provide supplementary academic enhancement.

   Developmental and enrichment services are designed to increase the academic aspirations and/or improve the academic preparation of junior and senior high school students. During the past six years, the University of California has taken a leadership role in this area, working through the Early Outreach Program (Partnership-University Partners) to provide academic advising, role model presentations, college and university visits, meetings with parents, counseling and tutoring for approximately 19,000 secondary school students annually. A second major effort by college staff to work with secondary school students is MESA, an intersegmental program cooperatively administered by staff from four-year colleges and secondary schools for students interested in pursuing careers in math-based fields.

   While both programs, particularly the latter, have been successful in providing developmental and enrichment services to the target students, there is a growing perception that this type of outreach effort will not be successful in achieving its ultimate objective unless it is coordinated with efforts to strengthen the school, so that these students are prepared for entry-level college work. Generally, developmental and enrichment services have been provided by college staff, with passive rather than active involvement by secondary school staff. It now seems apparent that further progress in this area requires the active involvement of the secondary school staff with particular emphasis upon strengthening the college-preparatory curriculum.

   In response to this situation, the Legislative Analyst has concluded that "the effectiveness of state-funded developmental outreach programs will be enhanced if responsibility for these programs is lodged with the State Department of Education." While arguing that low-income and ethnic



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*TABLE 6 State-Supported Student Affirmative Action and Equal Educational Opportunity Programs in California, 1982-83*

| Name of Program | Documentation | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Data Available to Demonstrate Success | Comprehensive Data Management | Specific Objectives | Interinstitutional Cooperation |
| Academic Enrichment Program (UC) | No | No | Yes | No |
| Cal-SOAP | Yes, for some of the projects | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Core Student Affirmative Action (CSU) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Demonstration Projects in Reading and Mathematics (SDE) | Yes | Yes | Yes | N/A |
| Early Outreach (UC) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Varies from campus to campus |
| EOP (CSU) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Varies from campus to campus |
| EOPS (CCC) | No | Is being developed | No | Varies from campus to campus |
| Immediate Outreach (UC) | No | No | Yes | Varies from campus to campus |
| MESA | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| University Minority Engineering Program | Initiated in September | Is being developed | Yes | N/A |
| Student Affirmative Action Transition Projects (CCC) | Not Yet | Yes | Yes | Varies from project to project |
| University SAA Support Services (UC) | Yes, in some areas, unclear in many areas | Varies from campus to campus | Varies from campus to campus | N/A |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| Incentives | Continuity of Services | Coordi-tion of Support Services | Involve-ment of Non-College Personnel | Careers |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| No | Yes | N/A | Not Clear | N/A |
| Yes | Yes | N/A | Yes | Yes |
| Yes | Varies from campus to campus | Yes | Varies from campus to campus | No |
| Yes | Yes | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| No | Yes | N/A | Varies from campus to campus | N/A |
| No | Yes | No | Varies from campus to campus | Varies from campus to campus |
| No | N/A | No | Varies from campus to campus | Varies from campus to campus |
| No | No | N/A | N/A | N/A |
| Yes | Yes | N/A | Yes | Yes |
| Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| No | Yes | N/A | Yes | Varies from project to project |
| No | N/A | Not Clear | Not Clear | Not Clear |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

minority students have a continuing need for developmental outreach services, the Legislative Analyst has concluded that "developmental outreach programs . . . are the sole responsibility of the K-12 segments," and the services "can be provided more effectively and at lower cost if the K-12 system takes the lead in doing so." Accordingly, it was recommended that State funds budgeted to support MESA be transferred from the postsecondary institutions to the State Department of Education, with a process implemented at some later date for transferring State funds for the Early Outreach Program from the University to the State Department of Education.

The Postsecondary Education Commission, in its report entitled Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part IV, concluded that "the major priority in the State effort during the next five years should be to strengthen the basic college-preparatory curriculum . . . at California's junior and senior high schools." In contrast to the Legislative Analyst's Office, however, the Commission concluded that "this effort must involve cooperation among secondary and postsecondary educators, parents, and local school boards." The problem of enhancing educational opportunities for low-income and ethnic minority students is a problem shared by secondary and postsecondary institutions, which neither institution can solve independently. While the current structure of the developmental outreach programs requires only passive involvement by the secondary schools, the placement of total responsibility for these programs within the K-12 segment will undesirably limit involvement by college and university staff. A new framework for developmental outreach emphasizing active, cooperative efforts by both secondary and postsecondary staff, and including curricular improvement at the secondary school site, should be developed and implemented statewide. Models for this new framework might include the College Core Curriculum at Phineas Banning High School in the Los Angeles Unified School District, the Cooperative College Preparatory Program in the Oakland Unified School District, and Project AVID at Clairemont High School in San Diego.

2. What is the most efficient and effective method to provide information services to ethnic minority and low-income secondary school students? These services should involve active and coordinated efforts by secondary and postsecondary educators, working through regional intersegmental organizations wherever possible.

Informational outreach services, which generally include academic and career advising, admissions and financial aid counseling, campus tours and information dissemination, are designed to provide information either about postsecondary alternatives generally or about a specific college in order to facilitate recruitment into that college. All public four-year colleges employ staff to provide these services at the secondary schools throughout the State with large ethnic minority enrollments. In addition, during the past four years, the State has funded five experimental interinstitutional projects through the Cal-SOAP Program, to test the feasibility of formal cooperative efforts by colleges and secondary schools in the provision of information outreach services. Through the enabling legislation for Cal-SOAP, the Legislature declared



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

that "additional efforts to increase college access for low-income students should take the form of interinstitutional programs organized regionally to reduce duplication of institutional efforts and student confusion." Currently, the preponderance of informational outreach services are provided through institutional rather than interinstitutional efforts.

The Legislative Analyst's Office, in its report on the 1983-84 Budget, has concluded that "there is considerable duplication among the three segments in terms of their informational outreach programs" and that cooperation among institutional efforts in informational outreach is inhibited because some campuses have placed primary emphasis upon recruitment of ethnic minority students into that campus. The Legislative Analyst has therefore recommended that the goal of informational outreach should be "to increase the enrollment of underrepresented students in postsecondary institutions generally, instead of at individual institutions and campuses." Moreover, in order to promote "the efficient use of resources, postsecondary outreach programs should be organized and funded on an intersegmental basis, rather than by individual segments acting alone."

While most of the duplication in informational outreach efforts has been eliminated during the past three years, the other conclusions and recommendations presented by the Legislative Analyst are consistent in philosophy with conclusions and recommendations presented previously by the Commission. For example, in Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part IV, the Commission concluded that:

> Undesirable competition is increasing among college outreach programs working on the eleventh and twelfth grade levels to identify and recruit minority students to specific institutions and campuses. This competition stems at least partially from staff perception that program success will be judged primarily by increases in a specific campus enrollment of target students. Such competition is not beneficial to the students and wastes limited State resources. It can be discouraged by holding outreach programs accountable only for the number of target students recruited into postsecondary education generally. In order to improve coordination of the college outreach programs, the successful components of the four-year pilot California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP) should be replicated throughout the State . . . . In addition, each of the segments should allocate funds in support of these coordinated, intersegmental efforts, as the University of California Systemwide Office has been doing the past three years, and should give priority to funding those projects with a demonstrated commitment to intersegmental coordination.

The Commission has consistently argued for the development of regional intersegmental cooperative efforts in outreach. The success of regional outreach efforts, as suggested by the Cal-SOAP model, is predicated upon two major elements: (1) the ability and willingness of all segments to commit resources to intersegmental efforts, and (2) the establishment of



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

a mechanism for governance of the regional effort. These two elements ensure that cooperation among institutions is achieved as each institution shares in the maintenance and decision making of the outreach effort in the region. To ensure regional cooperation, all segments must maintain some resources for outreach services which can be committed to intersegmental efforts. Further, the regional efforts should be developed in a manner which ensures that participating institutions share in the development and implementation of outreach efforts as they are cognizant of the unique needs in the region, the various strategies to address those needs, and the expertise to deliver quality services to local students.

3. Should the State continue its 13-year commitment to provide financial assistance and comprehensive academic support for students from low-income or disadvantaged educational backgrounds who do not meet the regular admissions requirements at public four-year colleges but who have demonstrated potential to succeed academically? While this commitment should be continued, consideration should be given to the identification of a possible more effective and efficient strategy to achieve this objective.

The Educational Opportunity Program at the California State University, as established by the Legislature in 1969, has primarily served those students who do not meet regular admission requirements, admitting approximately 6,000 new students annually to the State University as freshmen or transfer students and providing support services for over 17,000 continuing students. Funding for this program in the current year is approximately $14 million, providing students with a continuum of services beginning with recruitment through admissions, orientation, summer programs, financial assistance, and a heavy emphasis on tutoring and counseling.

Evaluations of comprehensive programs like the State University EOP, which serve economically and educationally disadvantaged students, are complicated by the difficulty in determining proper comparison groups to assess relative program success. With this caution in mind, available data indicate that approximately 13 percent of the EOP students receive a baccalaureate degree within 6 years of their enrollment as freshmen. (Approximately 40 percent of all students at the CSU receive a degree within 6 years. Data are not available to compare EOP students with non-EOP students with similar income and ethnic backgrounds.) Last year, in its 1982-83 Budget Report on Equal Educational Opportunity Programs, the Commission recommended continued funding for the State University's Educational Opportunity Program, while also recommending a comprehensive outside evaluation of the program.

The Legislative Analyst has recommended that the CSU's EOP and SAA programs be combined into a single program with two components--outreach and support services. The rationale for the consolidation of these two programs is (1) "increased effectiveness of the outreach and support services effort by increasing the number of students served, and (2) reduction of administrative costs associated with the maintenance of separate programs." While agreeing with the Legislative Analyst about



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the desirability of increasing the effectiveness of the existing outreach and support service efforts, decisions about the structure and organization of the CSU Educational Opportunity Program should follow discussions about (1) the continuing State commitment to assist people from low-income or disadvantaged educational backgrounds who do not meet regular admissions requirements to enroll in four-year institutions and complete baccalaureate programs, (2) the most effective strategy to implement this commitment, (3) whether the CSU Educational Opportunity Program should continue to focus on exception admits, and (4) the level of graduation expected of this group of students.

4. What is the most efficient and effective method to provide developmental and informational services to ethnic minority and low-income Community College students with the potential of completing a baccalaureate degree, so that a larger proportion of these students transfer to four-year institutions. There have been relatively few cooperative efforts in this area by the postsecondary institutions, and consequently we do not know the most efficient and effective method to provide these services.

Approximately 85 percent of the Chicanos/Latinos and Blacks enrolled in California's postsecondary education attend the California Community Colleges. Many never complete a certificate or terminal degree program and only a relatively small proportion ultimately transfer to four-year colleges or universities and complete a baccalaureate program. Despite the explicit State goal of increasing the number of ethnic minorities who graduate from public four-year colleges, only a small share of existing equal educational opportunity efforts have been devoted to encouraging and facilitating transfer. The only State-funded effort with the transfer process as its primary focus is the California Community Colleges Student Affirmative Action Transition Program, and the funding for this program terminates in June 1983.

In its report entitled Equal Educational Opportunity in California Postsecondary Education: Part IV, the Commission recommended:

> In order to improve the transfer opportunities from Community College to four-year institutions of underrepresented students with the potential of completing a baccalaureate program, transition to a baccalaureate awarding institution should be established as one of the major goals of the California Community Colleges and the Community College Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS), with substantial coordination of both institutional and existing EOPS funding for personnel and services to achieve this goal. In addition, the Legislature and the segments should review the relevant statutes and regulations to remove barriers to transition from one program to another and to assure greater program compatability between the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services of the Community Colleges and the Educational Opportunity Program of the California State University.

During the past year, the Los Angeles Community College District has initiated Project Asset in order to improve student retention and in-



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

crease transfer rates to four-year institutions. Throughout the State, smaller scale efforts are being initiated on many Community College campuses. While the emphasis on transfer from two- to four-year institutions has been growing, there is much which remains to be accomplished. However, for transition activities to be enhanced, joint responsibility must be assumed by the two- and the four-year segments. The University and the State University should become active participants by providing resources and personnel to cooperate with the Community Colleges in addressing this significant issue.

5. What is the most efficient and effective method to retain ethnic minority students in baccalaureate programs? While available data are limited, discipline-specific tutoring, advising, and counseling services appear to be more successful in retaining college students. While a wide variety of support services are necessary, faculty members tend to work more directly with students enrolled in their courses, placing their emphasis on academic achievement rather than remediation, and student study groups organized by discipline tend to encourage achievement by combining friendship with scholarship.

All public colleges and universities maintain tutoring, advising, and counseling services for students enrolled at the institution. In addition, large scale special support service efforts are provided for low-income and ethnic minority students through the educational opportunity and student affirmative action programs. The University and the State University have both developed good data management systems to provide information about the clients served through these special programs. The primary difficulty in analyzing these data is the lack of similar information about the clients served through the regular support service programs, and, therefore, the inability to make comparisons with the general university community.

Despite these limitations in the data, available information suggests that discipline-specific support services involving faculty more directly with students appears to have a positive impact on student retention. These discipline-specific programs also seem to be more successful than general programs in creating an "achievement"-oriented rather than a "remedial"-oriented environment, in which peer pressure is developed to encourage good academic work. Models of such programs include the Minority Engineering Program at California State University, Northridge, and the undergraduate Professional Development Program at the University of California, Berkeley. The former program was selected for replication throughout the State with funding through Governor Brown's Investment in People Program, starting in Fall 1982. The latter program has operated through funds from private foundations, faculty donations, and the federal government. The federal funding for this program will terminate in Summer 1983. Two other specific types of support efforts--the summer-bridge and math/science workshops--also seem to have been particularly effective in retaining ethnic minority and low-income students. Despite the evidence of success in these areas, the preponderance of State funds are allocated for general support service efforts for which only limited data and analysis are available to assess their effectiveness.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

1. Seventeen major programs in California in 1982-83 are designed to provide outreach and supportive services for low-income and ethnic minority students, with current funding approximately $32.5 million of State funds, $10.7 million of federal funds, and $3.5 million of student fee revenues. (These funding levels do not include the financial assistance components of the educational opportunity programs.) Approximately one-fourth of these funds is used in developmental outreach activities, one-half is expended through the comprehensive educational opportunity programs in the three public postsecondary segments, and one-sixth is used for retention efforts at the postsecondary institutions. The smallest proportion is allocated to informational outreach services.

2. During the past three years, an increasing proportion of Hispanic, Black, and Filipino high school graduates have enrolled in college, which provides some indication that the existing college outreach programs have been successful. To illustrate, from 1979 to 1981, there was a 2.9 percent increase in the number of Hispanic students who graduated from public California high schools. During the same period, there was a 17.3 percent increase in the number of Hispanic first-time freshmen (19 years of age and under) who enrolled in public postsecondary institutions, with a 4.0 percent increase in the University of California, a 16.5 percent increase in the State University, and an 18.3 percent increase in the Community Colleges. For Black students there was an 11.4 percent decrease in the number of high school graduates from 1979 to 1981. During the same time period, however, the number of Black first-time freshmen (19 years of age and under) who enrolled in the University of California increased by 14.0 percent and in the State University by 3.3 percent. There was a 7.6 percent decrease in the number of Blacks enrolling in the California Community Colleges, with a 5.4 percent decrease of Black enrollments in public postsecondary institutions generally. These data, as summarized on Table 7, provide some evidence that the existing outreach programs have been successful.

   Available data on college and university enrollment and graduation rates by ethnic minority students indicate mixed success in increasing the numbers who are retained through undergraduate programs and receive a baccalaureate degree. For Hispanic students there has been a moderate increase in the number and proportion enrolled in each of the three public segments during the past six years. There has been a similar increase in the number and proportion of Hispanic students receiving bachelor's and master's degrees during the past five years. In contrast, for Black students there has been a slight decrease in the proportion and a slight increase in the number enrolled in each of the public segments during the past six years. Among degree recipients, there has been an increase in the number and proportion of Blacks receiving baccalaureate degrees from the State University. However, among master's degree recipients at the State University, and bachelor's and master's degree recipients at the University of California, there has been a decrease from 1976-77 to the present. In short, a decreasing



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

*TABLE 7 Changing Distributions of Graduates of Public California High Schools and First-time Freshmen 19 and Under in Public Postsecondary Institutions, by Ethnicity, 1979 and 1981*

| | Asian | Black | Hispanic | Filipino | White |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES | | | | | |
| 1979 | 11,448 | 23,262 | 37,614 | 2,341 | 174,347 |
| 1981 | 15,149 | 20,618 | 38,698 | 3,009 | 165,370 |
| # Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 692 | -2,644 | +1,084 | + 668 | - 8,977 |
| % Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 9.9% | - 11.4% | + 2.9% | + 28.5% | - 5.1% |
| FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN | | | | | |
| UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA | | | | | |
| Fall 1979 | 2,202 | 726 | 1,014 | 282 | 12,471 |
| Fall 1981 | 2,673 | 828 | 1,055 | 461 | 12,463 |
| # Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 471 | + 102 | + 41 | + 179 | - 8 |
| % Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 21.4% | + 14.0% | + 4.0% | + 63.5% | - 0.1% |
| CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY | | | | | |
| Fall 1979 | 1,294 | 1,535 | 1,883 | 377 | 12,009 |
| Fall 1981 | 1,825 | 1,586 | 2,194 | 495 | 14,360 |
| # Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 531 | + 51 | + 311 | + 118 | + 2,351 |
| % Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 41.0% | + 3.3% | + 16.5% | + 31.2% | + 19.6% |
| CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES | | | | | |
| Fall 1979 | 4,832 | 12,418 | 14,934 | 1,423 | 80,950 |
| Fall 1981 | 4,895 | 11,471 | 17,665 | 1,365 | 72,469 |
| # Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 63 | - 947 | +2,731 | + 442 | - 8,481 |
| % Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 1.3% | - 7.6% | + 18.3% | + 31.1% | - 10.5% |
| FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN, PUBLIC POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS | | | | | |
| Fall 1979 | 8,328 | 14,679 | 17,831 | 2,082 | 105,430 |
| Fall 1981 | 9,393 | 13,885 | 20,914 | 2,821 | 99,292 |
| # Change, 1979 to 1981 | +1,065 | - 794 | +3,083 | + 739 | - 6,138 |
| % Change, 1979 to 1981 | + 12.8% | - 5.4% | + 17.3% | + 35.5% | - 5.8% |

NOTE: Data for American Indian students were not included because of several inaccuracies in these data.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

number of Black students have graduated from California's public colleges and universities during the past five years, despite the large scale equal educational opportunity efforts at each of these institutions.

3. Substantial progress has been made during the past three years in improving the general management of the several equal educational opportunity programs. Almost all programs now include a comprehensive data management component, so that information is routinely gathered and reported about the number and characteristics of the clients served, the services provided, and the impact of these services. The major exceptions to the general progress in this area, are (1) the Community College Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) and, (2) the University of California Immediate Outreach and Academic Enhancement Programs.

4. Most State-funded outreach efforts by postsecondary institutions continue to emphasize operations by individual institutions rather than explicit cooperative interinstitutional relationships with representatives from other colleges and universities in the surrounding region. The major exceptions to the generalization are the institutions which participate in Cal-SOAP (which by law involves cooperative, intersegmental operations) and to a lesser extent, the Core Student Affirmative Action Program at the California State University, MESA, and the Community College Student Affirmative Action Transition Program.

5. Three State-funded programs are administered so that program funds are distributed to the campuses through a process which recognizes and rewards institutional effectiveness in achieving the objectives of the program. These programs are Cal-SOAP and Core Student Affirmative Action at the State University, which both employ an annual completion grant review process, and the Demonstration Project in Reading and Mathematics, administered by the State Department of Education, which requires periodic evaluation of the projects and the elimination of the least cost-effective. The preponderance of State funds are allocated to programs which do not place a primary emphasis upon project effectiveness in the distribution of the funds to the campuses.

6. An outside evaluation of the MESA program has been completed by the Center for the Study of Evaluation at UCLA. The Center concluded that "the MESA Program is well-implemented with a coherent set of component services in place that reach targeted students. Further, the MESA program is perceived as effective by coordinators, advisors, parents, and students. These perceptions are borne out by data on academic performance indicating that MESA students perform significantly higher than students of the same ethnic background nationwide and than other college-preparatory students in their own schools."

7. A final evaluation of the Cal-SOAP program has been completed by the Postsecondary Education Commission, with the conclusion presented that "three years of experimentation by Cal-SOAP have demonstrated that substantial benefits result from interinstitutional coordination of outreach services: the duplication of effort by colleges is reduced,



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

and the services provided to students are enhanced." The Commission has therefore recommended that a new Cal-SOAP program be established in Summer 1984, with a narrower range of projects embodying critical features of the existing interinstitutional efforts. (This recommendation is included in SB 800, as introduced by Senator Hart in March 1983.) This proposed new program would replace the existing program, which will terminate on June 30, 1984.

8. The Legislature has directed the Postsecondary Education Commission to evaluate the Core Student Affirmative Action Program at the State University. In a review of Core published in January 1983, the Commission concluded that "almost all of the 19 State University campuses have made progress in implementing the Core Program . . . . The outreach component of the Core Program has been positively received by high school counselors and staff, who regard the Core staff as reliable, well-trained, and effective. Available data indicate that increasing numbers of minority students from secondary schools served by the Core Program are enrolling in college." The Commission also concluded that the outreach programs on most State University campuses need to be coordinated more effectively and that many campuses have not succeeded in establishing intersegmental outreach efforts. A final comprehensive evaluation of the Core Program will be completed by the Commission prior to legislative review of the 1984-85 Budget.

9. The Legislature has maintained an inconsistent policy on the evaluation of equal educational opportunity programs. While directing that an outside evaluation be completed of the MESA, Cal-SOAP, and Core Student Affirmative Action (CSU) programs, the Legislature has delegated the responsibility for evaluating the University of California's programs to the University systemwide office. Prior to 1977, the Legislature requested an outside evaluation of the State University's Educational Opportunity Program and the Community Colleges' Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS). However, since that date, the evaluation responsibilities have been delegated to the systemwide administrative offices, and no comprehensive review has been attempted to assess the effectiveness of either program. As a result of this policy, there is uneven knowledge about the operations and effectiveness of several equal educational opportunity programs.

10. During each of the past two years, the University of California Systemwide Office has published data demonstrating the impact of the Early Outreach Program which serves approximately 17,000 secondary school students annually. The objective of this program is to increase the number of target students who achieve eligibility for admission to public four-year colleges. Data provided by the Systemwide Office indicate that 37.5 percent of the 1,075 early outreach participants graduating in June 1981 were eligible for the University, with 22 percent of the participants actually enrolling in the University. The data for the following year indicate that 27.2 percent of the 2,365 early outreach participants were eligible for the University, with 16.8 percent actually enrolling in the University. Systemwide, 73.6 percent of the early outreach participants graduating with the class of 1982 enrolled in a public postsecondary institution. (For comparative purposes, approximately 60 percent of all high school graduates enroll



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in postsecondary institutions.) There is considerable disparity among the campuses in their University eligibility rate from the class of 1982, with a high of 66.2 percent at Santa Cruz to a low of 16.5 percent at Davis.

11. The Academic Enrichment Program of the University of California was a pilot program initiated four years ago to establish "MESA-like" projects involving University faculty working directly with secondary school students. As reported last year by the Commission, the University has thus far not completed a comprehensive evaluation to identify what was learned from this experimental effort. Moreover, during the past year, the Systemwide Administration has not gathered the impact data necessary for such an evaluation from three of the four campuses which have AEP projects.

12. The Community College Extended Opportunity Programs and Services is the largest State-funded program designed to identify and retain low-income, educationally disadvantaged students in postsecondary education. During the past year, the program served approximately 68,000 students, with an average expenditure of $360 per student. During 1980-81, an EOPS Evaluation Study Group was established to update existing evaluation procedures through the development and recommendation of long-range evaluation strategies for EOPS in the 1980s. While the Chancellor's Office staff is working to implement many of these recommendations, and while some information is now available about the grade point average of EOPS students, the general data necessary to assess the relative success of this program are not available.

13. During the past 12 years, the Educational Opportunity Program at the California State University has played an important role in providing access and support at baccalaureate awarding institutions for low-income and ethnic minority students who do not meet regular admissions standards but who are considered to have the potential to succeed at an academic institution. During 1980-81, more than 6,200 low-income and ethnic minority students enrolled in the State University as EOP students, with approximately 70 percent of them not eligible under the regular admissions requirements. Approximately 52 percent of the Black students and 31 percent of the Chicano students enrolled in the State University are EOP students. Less than 4 percent of the new EOP enrollees in Fall 1980 were academically disqualified after the first year of study. During 1980-81, the State University graduated 708 EOP students, with 147 of these students completing their studies in Business Management. Two important trends during the past few years in the EOP program at the State University are (1) a decreasing number of students being served through the program, and (2) a decreasing number of EOP students graduating from the University (for example, the number of graduates decreased from 848 in 1979-80 to 708 during 1980-81). Chancellor's Office staff has speculated that the lack of available financial assistance (primarily federal funds) has affected the enrollment of EOP students. Preliminary figures for 1982-83 show an increase in enrollment, which may be related to the increased availability of federal funds during the same period.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

14. The Professional Development Program (PDP) at the University of California, Berkeley, is a non-state funded effort which has had significant impact in working with ethnic minority and women students. The undergraduate component of this program currently provides various services to approximately 200 undergraduates at Berkeley who are enrolled in any of 24 mathematics, science, and English courses. Now in its fifth year of operation, available data indicate that PDP students have consistently out performed their non-PDP minority counterparts in each of the project's target courses. Moreover, in many of these courses, the average grade of PDP students have been equal to or higher than that of their non-minority classmates. While the program has helped to improve the academic performance of the participating students, it has also been successful in keeping students in the University. Available data indicate that the proportion of PDP students completing four and seven academic terms is higher than that among both their minority and their non-minority classmates. Because of the demonstrated success of the PDP approach, efforts have been initiated to establish similar projects at UCLA, UC San Diego, and CSU San Diego. The funding for this effort has come from four sources: faculty contributions, institutional contributions, the private sector, and the U.S. government. This last source of funding will end in June 1983.

15. The University of California systemwide office has collected relatively comprehensive data about students served through the academic support services for minority and low-income students. The January 1983 report from that office gave emphasis to summer transition programs at the San Diego and Berkeley campuses. The San Diego program provides summer instruction and pre-entrance counseling to high risk minority and low-income students who will be enrolling at the University in the fall. Available data indicate these services, as well as follow-up academic assistance and counseling throughout the first year, significantly improve the retention rate of the target students. A report from the campus states that "it is important to emphasize the distinction between a program that is primarily intended to remediate deficiencies and one whose main purpose is to integrate low-income and minority students into the campus. Summer Bridge is not a remedial program. For example, although some students arrive with deficiencies in math skills, others are proficient . . . . The Summer Bridge Program is designed to address many issues that affect a student's decision to stay at the University, to build a network of peer group support, and to make the campus a familiar place before the fall quarter begins." While many four-year colleges have similar summer transition programs, these programs are all small-scale efforts serving a relatively small proportion of the incoming ethnic minority and low-income students.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## RECOMMENDATIONS

In order to increase substantially the number of ethnic minority students graduating from postsecondary institutions during the next five years, the priorities in State funding of outreach and support service programs should be (1) improved academic preparation of ethnic minority students while they are enrolled in secondary school, (2) increased retention of minority students enrolling in college, particularly those majoring in the mathematics and science-based disciplines, and (3) increased transition of minority students from two-year to four-year institutions, after these students have completed their academic objectives at the Community Colleges. In working toward the achievement of these priorities, particular emphasis should be placed upon cooperative interinstitutional efforts as a means to utilize the existing limited resources as effectively as possible.

Within this general framework of priorities, the Commission staff recommendations for the 1983-84 Budget are the following:

1. If the Legislature wishes to augment equal educational opportunity budgets, then the first priority in the allocation of this funding should be for the operation of the undergraduate component of the Professional Development Program at the University of California at Berkeley (which is losing its federal funding in July 1983), and the replication of this model on other selected four-year campuses. These funds should be allocated through a competitive process with institutions expected to provide equal dollar matching. If additional funding is not available, the University of California Systemwide should give high priority to: (1) maintaining current funding levels for the Berkeley program, and (2) if possible, replicating the Berkeley program on other University of California campuses by reallocating existing State dollars provided for programs to improve retention.

2. Current funding levels should be continued through 1983-84 for those equal educational opportunity programs which have recently been reviewed as successful by an outside evaluation agency. These programs are (1) MESA/MEP, (2) Core Student Affirmative Action in the State University, (3) the Demonstration Projects in Reading and Mathematics, and (4) Cal-SOAP.

3. Current funding levels for the University of California's Early Outreach Program should be continued through 1983-84. However, since this is the only sizable outreach effort by colleges working at the junior high level, and since preliminary data provided by the University indicate some program success, it is imperative that an outside evaluation of this program be conducted by non-University employees prior to decisions about the 1984-85 Budget.

4. Current funding levels for the State University's Educational Opportunity Program should be continued through 1983-84. During the next nine months, representatives from the State University, working with staff from the Postsecondary Education Commission, the Legislative



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Analyst's Office, and the California Community Colleges, should review existing as well as alternative strategies to provide financial assistance and comprehensive academic support for students from low-income or disadvantaged educational backgrounds who do not meet the regular admissions requirements at public four-year colleges but who have demonstrated potential to complete baccalaureate programs. The conclusions and recommendations of the CSU Systemwide EOP Advisory Committee (chaired by President La Bounty of CSPU, Pomona) should be considered by this ad hoc committee as it conducts this review. Prior to legislative review of the 1984-85 Budget, this ad hoc committee should recommend an effective and efficient strategy to achieve this objective.

5. The lack of available information about students served through the Community Colleges' Extended Opportunity Programs and Services precludes the Commission from making recommendations about appropriate funding levels for this program in 1983-84. In order to provide more detailed information about the impact of the EOPS program, the Chancellor's Office should hire an outside evaluator with the responsibility of determining the proportion of EOPS students who complete degree or certificate programs and/or transfer to four-year institutions, as well as any other information considered essential in determining the relative success of the EOPS program. On the basis of similar program evaluations, it is estimated that this evaluation will cost $30,000, which the Chancellor's Office should fund from existing resources. This evaluation should be completed prior to legislative review of the 1984-85 Budget.

6. The University of California and the California State University should be directed to prepare plans (with a timetable for implementation) for consolidating on each campus existing student affirmative action programs, educational opportunity programs, and other appropriate programs and services. This consolidated effort should include two components--outreach and retention. In preparing these plans which should be submitted to the Legislative Budget Committees by February 1, 1984, each systemwide office should:

   a. Allow sufficient flexibility in the implementation of the concept so that each campus has the ability to adopt a model which is responsive to local campus needs,

   b. Provide for the continuation of all necessary services provided by existing programs,

   c. Restructure the programs based upon an appraisal of the effectiveness of existing services,

   d. Include a process for the distribution of program funds which recognizes and rewards institutional effectiveness in achieving the objectives of the program, and

   e. Emphasize the active involvement in the operations of the program by senior administrators and faculty, with equal educational opportunity efforts defined as comprehensive institutional efforts coordinating all existing campus resources.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7. Representatives of the segments of public postsecondary education, as well as secondary education, should be directed to work with the Commission in the preparation of a plan for new policy directions in equal educational opportunity efforts which will:

   a. Place expanded responsibility for strengthening college preparatory curricula of minority and low-income students with the secondary schools and the State Department of Education,

   b. Propose developmental outreach efforts (tutoring and academic enhancement) for secondary school students which include the active and coordinated efforts of secondary and postsecondary educators,

   c. Place greater responsibility for the delivery of informational outreach services on intersegmental efforts in the geographical areas where they seem most appropriate,

   d. Place expanded and shared responsibility with the three public segments of postsecondary education for increasing the transfer opportunities from Community Colleges to baccalaureate awarding institutions for low-income and ethnic minority students, and

   e. Propose an evaluation strategy to be used by the Commission in the annual review of all State-funded equal educational opportunity programs so that comprehensive and comparable information is available about the operations and effectiveness of each program. This plan should be prepared prior to legislative review of the 1984-85 Budget Act.



AVAILABLE

APPENDIX A

Summary of Existing Outreach and Support Service Programs


| | Page |
|---|---|
| California Community Colleges Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) | 32 |
| California Community Colleges' Student Affirmative Action and Extended Opportunities Program and Services (EOPS) Transition Projects | 34 |
| California State Department of Education, Demonstration Programs in Reading and Mathematics | 37 |
| California State Department of Education, Special Projects Unit | 39 |
| California State University Core Student Affirmative Action Program | 41 |
| California State University Educational Opportunity Program (EOP) | 46 |
| California Student Opportunity and Access Program (Cal-SOAP) | 49 |
| Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement (MESA) | 53 |
| Quest for Engineering, Science and Technology (QUEST) A Minority Engineering Program | 55 |
| Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students | 58 |
| California Upward Bound Projects | 58 |
| California Talent Search Projects | 61 |
| California Educational Opportunity Centers | 64 |
| California Special Services for Disadvantaged Students | 66 |
| University of California Academic Enrichment Programs | 70 |
| University of California Academic Support Services | 74 |
| University of California Early Outreach Program (Partnership--Junior High School Component) | 77 |
| University of California Early Outreach Program (Partnership--Senior High School Component) | 80 |
| University of California Immediate Outreach Program | 83 |


BEST COPY AVAILABLE



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES EXTENDED OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS AND SERVICES (EOPS)

The Extended Opportunity Program and Services (EOPS) of the California Community Colleges, established in 1969, is directed toward the goal of recruiting and retaining students handicapped by language, social and economic disadvantages and facilitating their successful participation in the educational pursuits of the college. Eligibility criteria for the EOPS program are primarily economic. Title 5 of the California Administrative Code states that EOPS students cannot have a family income greater than $9,999 for a family of four, $8,999 for a family of three, and $6,999 for a family of two. Efforts to identify EOPS students concentrate on students already enrolled at the Community Colleges as well as students in the high schools.

The basic services of the EOPS program are:

1. Tutoring in academic subjects for Community College students.

2. Academic and career counseling for Community College students.

3. Outreach, including direct recruitment, early contact with junior high school level students, and special readiness activities prior to college enrollment.

4. Special instruction, such as in basic skills, study skills, language development, translation, library utilization, career planning classes, and ethnic studies.

5. Cultural enrichment functions, designed to enhance the appreciation of cultural differences and similarities among students and college staff.

6. Direct grants, work-study, and/or short-term loans.

### Funding History

| 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $11,484,027 | $13,983,157 | $17,389,919 | $20,472,092 | $23,462,000 | $24,761,000 |

Funding Utilization: The Chancellor's Office reports that approximately 41 percent of total EOPS funds are utilized for direct financial aid, 49 percent are utilized for educational programs and support services, and 9 percent are utilized for general management services. Within the category of services, 10 percent of total



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

funds are utilized for outreach, 17 percent for instruction and tutoring, 13 percent for counseling, and 9 percent for other services.

Numbers Served

| 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 40,724 | 48,679 | 59,001 | 62,381 | 67,890 | 67,890 |

Evaluation Data

In 1976, the Evaluation and Training Institute prepared a report entitled "The Study of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services" which was prepared to provide ". . . a comprehensive evaluation of EOPS with conclusions relative to determining the extent of Community Colleges meeting the objectives . . . " specified for EOPS. In 1979, the Chancellor's Office issued a preliminary report to the Legislature on the "Impact of EOPS on Participating Students in Terms of Outreach, Retention, and Post-College Follow-up." In addition, annual reports are made to the Board of Governors about the EOPS program. During 1980-81, an EOPS Evaluation Study Group was established to update existing evaluation procedures through the development and recommendation of long-range evaluation strategies for EOPS in the 1980s. During the past two years, the Chancellor's Office staff has worked to implement many of these recommendations.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES' STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION AND EXTENDED OPPORTUNITIES PROGRAM AND SERVICES (EOPS) TRANSITION PROJECTS

The California Community Colleges received funding in the 1980-81 Budget to establish three pilot student affirmative action transition projects designed to:

1. Identify potential transfer students from underrepresented ethnic minorities on each campus and to provide them with support services,

2. Provide opportunities for these students to enroll concurrently at a four-year institution in an attempt to acquaint them with the academic skills necessary for success at a four-year institution,

3. Provide opportunities for work experience internships for these students, and

4. Orient two- and four-year college personnel to increase their sensitivity and responsiveness to the special problems of disadvantaged transfer students.

In January 1981, the Chancellor's Office selected three project sites involving the following campuses:

| | |
|---|---|
| Sacramento: | California State University, Sacramento<br>Sierra Community College |
| Merced/Modesto: | California State College, Stanislaus<br>Merced College<br>Modesto Junior College<br>San Joaquin Delta College |
| San Diego: | Point Loma College<br>San Diego City College<br>San Diego Community College District<br>San Diego Mesa College<br>San Diego Miramar College<br>San Diego State University<br>Southwestern College<br>United States International University<br>University of California, San Diego |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Funding History

The projects began serving participants in Spring and Fall 1981 with approximately $72,000 each in funding. Current year funding (January 83 - June 83) averaged $37,000 for each project.

## Numbers Served

| | 1981 | 1982 |
|---|---|---|
| Sacramento | 55 | 50 |
| Merced | 65 | 68 |
| San Diego | 120 | 100 |

In addition to the three Student Affirmative Action Transition Projects, six Community Colleges are implementing transition pilot projects through Extended Opportunities Program and Services (EOPS). These project sites include: Butte College, Monterey Peninsula College, Chabot College, Santa Ana College, and a joint project at Imperial Valley and Palomar Colleges. The EOPS Transition Projects began in October 1981 under three broad program areas: (1) Student Transition (general), (2) Math/Science, and (3) Innovative Projects.

## Funding History

Project funding in 1981-82 ranged from $8,000 to $57,000, for a total of $212,000 for all six projects. In 1982-83, project funding ranged from $20,400 to $69,500, for a total of $243,465.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Numbers Served

| | 1981-82 | 1982-83 (estimated) |
|---|---|---|
| Butte | 50 | 40 |
| Monterey | 25 | 70 |
| Chabot | 75 | 100 |
| Santa Ana | -- | 30 |
| Imperial Valley | 240 | 300 |
| Palomar | 166 | 334 |

Evaluation Data

The Postsecondary Education Commission has the responsibility to report to the Legislature by December 31, 1983, on the effectiveness of student affirmative action transition projects projects in the Community Colleges.

In addition, the Commission will evaluate the six EOPS transition projects. Because of the similarity between the SAA and EOPS transition projects, it was determined by Commission staff that one evaluation of all nine projects would provide more comprehensive data on problems and barriers to transfer.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS IN READING AND MATHEMATICS

The Demonstration Programs in reading and mathematics were created in 1969 when the California State Legislature enacted Assembly Bill 938 with an appropriation of $3 million. AB 938 represents an effort to stress proficiency in reading and/or mathematics for student populations from low-income neighborhoods, high transiency, and low test scores in grades 7, 8, and 9.

Eligible districts defined as "those having schools of greatest need" can compete for first-year appropriations to support a program in the seventh grade, the eighth grade in the second year, and the ninth grade in the third of a junior high school.

Under legislative mandate, in order to keep their funding, participating schools must:

- Show definite academic improvement for underachieving youngsters in reading and/or mathematics.
- Create a highly systematized program which could be replicated at another school site.
- Produce high student achievement.
- Disseminate information to other school people about successful practices learned in the programs.

### Funding History

Funding for the Demonstration Programs has continued at approximately $3 million annually since the Program began in 1969. The funding level for the 1982-83 current budget consists of $3,558,000 for approximately 28 Demonstration Projects representing 19 districts throughout the State. The funding formula for the Programs takes into account learning achievement based on the difference between expected gains in achievement and actual gains, as measured by pre- and post-test scores in the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS) and the program cost per school site. The least cost effective schools are dropped from the Program each year.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Numbers Served

Approximately 9,000 students are expected to be served in 1982-83.

Evaluation

The comprehensive evaluation design per project is determined entirely at the local district or school level. Information reported by the State Department of Education stemming from the 1981-82 local evaluations indicated a median of 2.5 months of growth in reading and 2.9 months of growth in mathematics per each month of program instruction. During the same school year, the median increase in reading was 183 percent and 370 percent in mathematics over predicted scores in light of the low pre-test score characteristics of participating students. Additionally, the Legislative Analyst's Office reviewed the Program in detail in preparation for their analysis of the 1980-81 Budget Bill and concluded that the Demonstration Programs are:

- exemplary programs;
- providing leadership to other schools with compensatory education program funding; and
- appear to result in improved student performance.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CALIFORNIA STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION, SPECIAL PROJECTS UNIT

University and College Opportunities Program (ESEA Title IV-C)

Title IV-C of the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act provides funding for local educational agencies to develop and field test new models, techniques, strategies, and solutions to current educational problems. While any of the identified project categories can be directed toward the needs of ethnic minority and low-income students, the California State Board of Education has reserved funding for projects which deal with the preparation of minority students for successful college and university performance. Through the framework of the University and College Opportunities Program, 10 grants were awarded in 1979 to educational agencies with the general goal of increasing the number of students from underrepresented groups who are eligible for and enroll in a four-year college or university. The specific objectives of the projects included the following:

1. Participating students complete a college-preparatory curriculum which meets the University of California's minimum entrance requirements;

2. Project staff and school faculty develop special teaching skills and be knowledgeable about strategies for meeting the unique needs of potentially high-achieving minority students;

3. All parents (guardians) of participating students be knowledgeable about college academic requirements and be supportive of their children's participation in the college preparation program; and

4. Participating students be aware of their career interests and what academic preparation is required for each such career.

Due to the competitive nature of IV-C funding and the annual application process, 6 of the 10 projects were funded as third-year replication projects in 1981-82. Each funded site replicated its program at a new high school site with little new money in addition to the previously funded sites. The six projects and grants, as selected by the State Department of Education, for 1981-82 were as follows:



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Los Angeles Unified School District: "High School/University Interaction Program," to serve 309 students | $99,453 | $103,131 | $81,262 |
| 2. Los Angeles Unified School District: "Prep," to serve 915 students | 89,975 | 92,787 | 89,257 |
| 3. Orange County Department of Education: "Students Capture Opportunities to Redirect Their Education (SCORE)," to serve 835 students | 79,411 | 79,346 | 96,606 |
| 4. Sacramento City Unified School District: "Operation Success: A College Headstart Program," to serve 433 students | 67,671 | 67,671 | 62,257 |
| 5. Oakland Unified School District: "Oakland Scholars and Achievers College Eligibility Program," to serve 625 students | 71,000 | 65,458 | 64,423 |
| 6. San Diego County Department of Education: "Operation Success," to serve 360 students | 73,957 | 67,000 | 66,159 |

In 1982-83, two of the projects (Project PREP in Los Angeles and Project SCORE in Orange County) were selected as exemplary by the State Department of Education, and the project directors were hired for the year to travel throughout the State and present their findings to colleagues in secondary and postsecondary institutions.

## Program Funding History

| 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|
| $700,000 | $700,000 | $459,964 |

## Numbers Served

During the initial year of the program, 4,627 secondary school students were served. In the 1980-81 year, 5,471 students were served and 3,477 students are expected to be served in 1981-82. During 1982-83, which is the final year of funding for the two exemplary projects, students are not being served directly.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY CORE STUDENT AFFIRMATIVE ACTION PROGRAM

The Core Student Affirmative Action program is designed to respond to the underrepresentation of ethnic minorities, low-income individuals, and women in the California State University and Colleges system. As implemented on each campus in the State University system in 1980-81, the "Core" program provides for: (1) intensive outreach at the undergraduate level to identify and assist regularly eligible applicants; (2) expansion of basic retention efforts for minority, low-income and women students; and (3) educational enhancement and improvement in counselor and teacher preparation.

In 1978-79, State General Fund support ($130,000) was provided for pilot outreach efforts by three State University campuses--Dominguez Hills, Fresno, and San Jose. The primary emphasis of each of these pilot projects was to experiment with nontraditional outreach approaches. At the Fresno campus, for example, the primary objective was to increase the enrollment of Chicano students from the northern San Joaquin Valley through contact with parents and prospective students at community and high school cultural programs of ethnic theater, dance, music, and art.

In 1979-80, State General Fund support ($730,000) was provided to: (1) continue the special outreach projects initiated during the 1978-79 academic year on the Dominguez Hills, Fresno, and San Jose campuses; (2) establish on the four CSUC campuses located in the Los Angeles Basin a unique regional outreach effort in conjunction with the Los Angeles Unified School District; and (3) establish on two CSUC campuses regional outreach approaches in rural settings. The project in the Los Angeles area linked four CSUC campuses with 17 high schools in a cooperative program with four basic components: (1) a regional advisory group with representatives from the high schools, Community Colleges, and the State University, which had the responsibility to "coordinate and deploy available resources to meet most effectively the needs of the region;" (2) paraprofessional outreach to high schools, with trained college students assisting professional staff; (3) extensive involvement of parents in the outreach effort; and (4) counselor in-service training programs designed to develop workshop models and materials which will provide relevant and accurate information to counselors to increase their awareness of the needs of ethnic minority students.

As a result of these pilot projects, 4,169 applications to higher education institutions were generated. Of these applications, 3,261 were offered admission to a college or university. Of the nearly 4,200 applications generated, 47.8 percent were to CSUC campuses, 36.6 percent were to Community College campuses, and 15.6



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

percent were to the University of California or other institutions (independent colleges, out-of-state colleges).

In 1980-81 and subsequent years, State General Fund support has been was provided to establish and operate a "Core Student Affirmative Action" effort on all 19 CSUC campuses. Each campus developed an action plan designed to coordinate and expand, where necessary, existing services, resources, personnel, and policies within the areas of outreach, retention/supportive services, and educational enhancement. Through a competitive proposal review process, available funding is allocated among the 19 campuses, with the funding levels during 1982-83 ranging from a low of $50,618 to $165,879. (Representatives from the Department of Finance, Legislative Budget Committee, and the Postsecondary Education Commission participated in the proposal review process.) There are seven basic components to the Core approach as it is being implemented in the CSUC system: (1) outreach efforts directed to the family unit; (2) expanded direct relations between the University and the minority community; (3) use of nontraditional, culturally sensitive media and information dissemination practices; (4) development of a more supportive college environment; (5) CSUC faculty and staff in-servicing activities; (6) intersegmental cooperation between high schools, Community Colleges, the University of California, and othe postsecondary institutions; and (7) improvement and augmentation of counselor and teacher education programs. In 1980-81, available funds were allocated with 60 percent for outreach, 30 percent for retention, and 10 percent for educational enhancement. During subsequent years, funds have been allocated with 40 percent for outreach, 40 percent for retention, and 20 percent for educational enhancement.

In October 1981, five CSU Core SAA programs received special funding to establish and test experimental retention center pilot projects. The primary objective of the Centers was to augment current retention resources through the development of a centralized intake, diagnostic and referral mechanism that would assist SAA target students to better utilize existing resources. The five campuses with these referral centers were: Chico, Dominguez Hills, Northridge, San Jose, and Sonoma.

Funding History

| 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $130,000 | $730,000 | $1,881,828 | $2,389,481 | $2,558,489 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Numbers Served

The CSUC Chancellor's Office annually publishes a report entitled "Funded Student Affirmative Action Projects in the California State University and Colleges: Activities and Accomplishments" which provides detailed information concerning the number of outreach and retention activities, the number of participants in each activity, the number of applications generated, and the number of applications accepted.

These reports provide the following information:

## Outreach Activity

| | 1980-81 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|
| Outreach events | 1,392 | 1,139 |
| Number of distinct participants | 48,991 | 41,913 |
| Number of applications generated* | 6,930 | 7,530 |
| Number of applications accepted* | 4,440 | 5,103 |

* Includes applications to all segments of higher education.

## Retention Activity

These retention activities include: academic advisory, counseling, tutoring, peer mentor, faculty mentor, orientation, workshops, cultural events, referrals, learning assistance, and testing.

| | 1980-81 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|
| Number of distinct participants | 5,964 | 3,739 |
| Referral Center Projects: Number of distinct particpants | | 1,380 |

## Educational Enhancement Activity

These educational enhancement activities include: campus and field in-service sessions, campus and field class presentations, and campus and community organization presentations.

| | 1980-81 | 1981-82 |
|---|---|---|
| Educational Enhancement Activities | 81 | 552 |
| Number of participants | 6,581 | 7,254 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Evaluation Data

Since the Core SAA program is in the third year of its operation, the data necessary for a comprehensive assessment of the program are not yet available. The Postsecondary Education Commission, which has the responsibility to evaluate the program, reported in an review of the program published in January 1983, that

- Almost all of the 19 State University campuses have made progress in implementing the Core Program. This progress reflects the involvement of senior campus administrators and faculty as well as strong administrative support from the Chancellor's Office.

- The outreach component of the Core Program has been positively received by high school counselors and staff, who regard the Core staff as reliable, well-trained, and effective. Available data indicate that increasing number of minority students from secondary schools served by the Core Program are enrolling in college.

- Better coordination of the outreach programs on most State University campuses is needed. The establishment of Core outreach has meant that three different offices now provide outreach services on most of these campuses. Better coordination among these offices will increase the effective use of the limited resources available for this function. The Office of Student Outreach Services on the San Diego State University campus provides a model for outreach coordination that other campuses might well adopt.

- Most State University campuses have not succeeded in establishing intersegmental outreach efforts. The Chancellor's Office has prescribed that each campus create a Student Affirmative Action Advisory Committee designed to coordinate activities among colleges within the region. These committees have generally been ineffective in the achievement of that objective, and most State University outreach staff have only limited contact with their University of California colleagues.

- Finally, the Chancellor's Office has developed an effective process for distributing State funds to those campuses making the most progress in implementing the Core Program. Its competitive grant approach has stimulated institutional efforts at student affirmative action, rewarded those campuses; that demonstrate high commitment and successful efforts, and penalized those with lower commitment and success. As the Core Program moves into its third year, the funding cycle for campuses with successful programs might be expanded to three years, in order



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to retain the program's competitive element while reducing time-consuming proposal preparation on these campuses.

During the coming year, the Commission will complete a comprehensive evaluation of the Core SAA program.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM (EOP)

The California State University and Colleges' EOP program, established in 1969, is directed toward the goal of providing access and support for students from low-income or disadvantaged educational backgrounds who have the potential to succeed academically in accredited curricula. The program focuses on admitting primarily those students who do not meet regular admission requirements, although approximately 30 percent are admitted as regular admits.

The program includes both high school students--primarily seniors--and transfers from community colleges who need support services to succeed at the CSUC. Each campus serves high schools within its service area that have a high population of disadvantaged/minority students.

Students are selected for admission into EOP on the basis of four major factors:

1. Disadvantaged applicants admitted as exception admits under Section 40901 of Title 5;

2. Low-income status and history of economic disadvantageness;

3. Potential for success in CSUC accredited curricula; and

4. Level of educational, cultural and environmental disadvantageness.

While access is a major focus of the EOP program, even more important are the support service and retention components. EOP provides a continuum of services beginning with recruitment through admissions, orientation, summer programs, and a heavy emphasis on tutoring and counseling. Specifically, services provided during recruitment and outreach include:

1. Presentations to high school classes and general assemblies regarding admissions procedures, EOP services, and academic programs.

2. Individual conferences with counselors, as well as workshops regarding EOP policies and admissions procedures.

3. Special film and slide presentations aimed at motivating disadvantaged/minority students to attend college.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. Special evening presentations for students and parents regarding admission, financial aid, and other aspects of college life.

5. When necessary, home visits are scheduled with parent and applicant.

6. Campus tours.

7. Individual admissions and financial aid counseling.

8. Campus orientation programs.

9. Follow-up and individual assistance with completion of admissions and financial aid forms.

## Funding History

| 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $11,156,888 | $11,965,859 | $11,831,399 | $13,496,000 | $14,117,000 | $14,652,000 |

## Students Served

Each year, EOP enrolls approximately 6,000 new students as freshmen or transfer students. Currently, the program has approximately 17,300 new and continuing students.

| 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13,545 | 13,799 | 14,797 | 15,225 | 15,139 | 13,799* |

*Budgeted figure per staffing formula. Actual data will be higher.

Among new EOP enrollees in 1979-80, 37.2 percent were Black, 23.4 percent were Chicano, and 10.0 percent were White.

## Evaluation Data

The Chancellor's Office annually collects comprehensive data about students served through the Educational Opportunity Program. In fact, among equal educational opportunity programs, this program appears to have the most comprehensive data network, including information about the academic performance and graduation rates of students in the program, by campus, by ethnicity, by sex, and by academic discipline. The available data indicate that the EOP program has been successful during the past ten years in (1) recruiting large numbers of ethnic minority students into the CSU system, and (2) retaining these students, who generally do not meet



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

the regular admissions requirements, at a higher rate than ethnic minority students are retained within the CSU system generally. The Chancellor's Office reports that (1) among the 6,290 new EOP enrollees in 1979-80, only 178 were disqualified for academic reasons; (2) 848 EOP students were graduated in 1979-80 with the largest number of these majoring in Public Affairs and Services and Business Management, and (3) the mean total GPA for EOP students in 1979-80 was 2.30. For 1980-81, the Chancellor's Office reports that: (1) among the 6,256 new EOP enrollees, 199 were disqualified for academic reasons; (2) 708 EOP students were graduated in 1980-81 with the largest number of these majoring in Business Management (147) and Public Affairs and Services (99); and (3) the mean total GPA for EOP students in 1980-81 was 2.31.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## CALIFORNIA STUDENT OPPORTUNITY AND ACCESS PROGRAM (Cal-SOAP)

The California Student Opportunity and Access Program, as initiated in September 1979, established five interinstitutional pilot projects designed to increase accessibility into postsecondary education for low-income high school and community college students. The projects are also expected to reduce unnecessary duplication in outreach efforts as well as utilize college students as peer counselors and tutors for low-income high school students. The five projects and grant awards, as selected by the Student Aid Commission, are the following:

| | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Central Coast EOP/S Consortium (Project AQUI) (Santa Clara County) | $51,000 | $41,400 | $36,000 | $36,530 |
| 2. East Bay Consortium | $50,000 | $50,000 | $62,100 | $55,591 |
| 3. San Diego County Cal-SOAP Consortium | $60,000 | $71,000 | $86,250 | $81,174 |
| 4. Solano University and Community College Education Support Services (SUCCESS) (Solano-Yolo Counties) | $47,000 | $43,800 | $54,970 | $50,965 |
| 5. South Coast EOP/S Consortium (Orange County) | $42,000 | $43,800 | $54,970 | $50,965 |

Each project targets students who meet the income eligibility requirements established by the Student Aid Commission (a 1978 income of less than $12,500 for a family of one to four children, $13,000 with five children, and $13,500 with six children). With the exception of the San Diego program, the primary goal of the projects is to raise the achievement level of low-income students through motivational and academic support programs such as tutoring, on-campus living experience, campus visitations, and cultural events and field trips. The primary goal of the San Diego Cal-SOAP project is to develop a cost-effective system that coordinates and disseminates information to target students about postsecondary opportunities. The services provided include peer and cross-age counseling, a college information hot-line, and a comprehensive student information system.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Funding History

| 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|
| $250,000 | $250,000 | $267,500 | $275,225 |

Numbers Served

Since each of the projects provided differing services at differing levels of intensity, the number of students served are not comparable among the five projects.

| | 1981-82 |
|---|---|
| 1. Central Coast EOP/S Consortium (Project AQUI) | |
| High School Students Served (unduplicated number) | 296 |
| Community College Students Served (unduplicated number) | 93 |
| Total expenditures, 1981-82 | $78,000 |
| Total expenditures per student served | $200.51 |
| 2. East Bay Consortium | |
| High School Students Served (unduplicated number) | 703 |
| Community College Students Served (unduplicated number) | 208 |
| Total Expenditures, 1981-82 | $124,652 |
| Total Expenditures Per Student Served | $132.19 |
| 3. San Diego County Cal-SOAP Consortium | |
| High School Students Served (unduplicated number) | 3,933 |
| Community College Students Served (unduplicated number) | 545 |
| Total Expenditures, 1981-82 | $251,609 |
| Total Expenditures Per Student Served | $56.19 |
| 4. Solano County SUCCESS Consortium | |
| High School Students Served (unduplicated number) | 324 |
| Community College Students Served (unduplicated number) | 13 |
| Total Expenditures, 1981-82 | $104,287 |
| Total Expenditures Per Student Served | $309,46 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

5. South Coast EOP/S Consortium

| | |
|---|---|
| High School Students Served (unduplicated number) | 642 |
| Community College Students Served (unduplicated number) | 45 |
| Total Expenditures, 1981-82 | $126,681 |
| Total Expenditures Per Student Served | $184.40 |

## Evaluation Data

The Postsecondary Education Commission has the responsibility for evaluating this pilot program. In February 1983, the Commission, in a report entitled The California Student Opportunity and Access Program: A Final Evaluation, concluded that:

> As a result of the provision of Cal-SOAP funding, three new interinstitutional consortia were established--in San Diego County, Solano County, and the East Bay Counties. Each of these consortia has facilitated the delivery of educational services to low-income students within their region, especially by the San Diego and Solano County projects. In addition, two existing consortia in the South Coast and Central Coast areas were expanded through the use of Cal-SOAP funding. However, these two projects--and especially the latter--were ineffective and failed to achieve their objectives.
>
> The Cal-SOAP Program has identified a model for the delivery of outreach services to secondary school students which reduced the duplication of effort among colleges within a region, while also enhancing the services available to both target students and consortium members. This model includes an interinstitutional effort to provide informational, motivational, and academic services to low-income and ethnic minority students in the secondary schools. For the secondary school district, the model supplements counseling activities by assisting school sites with college advisement and by coordinating high school recruitment activities in order to minimize classroom interruptions. For the postsecondary institutions, the model complements their outreach activities through the identification of potential eligible applicants, the provision of logistical arrangements for high school and Community College visits, training activities for members' staff, assistance with student visits to college campuses, and the dissmeination of educational materials.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The enabling legislation specified that the pilot Cal-SOAP projects should not continue beyond June 30, 1983. In the 1982-83 Budget Act, the Legislature extended this deadline to June 30, 1984. The Postsecondary Education Commission has recommended that a new Cal-SOAP Program be established in summer 1984, with the new program having a narrower range of projects embodying critical features of the existing interinstitutional efforts which have been successful.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## MATHEMATICS, ENGINEERING, SCIENCE ACHIEVEMENT (MESA)

The primary goal of the MESA program is to increase the number of California high school graduates from underrepresented minority groups with the needed information and academic preparation in mathematics, science, and English to pursue a university or college education in a mathematics based-field. The specific objectives of the program are to:

1. Increase the number of students from target minority groups who major in mathematics, engineering, and the physical sceinces in college;

2. Promote career awareness so that participating students may learn of opportunities in the mathematics- and science-related professions early to prepare for them; and

3. Motivate officials from secondary schools, universities, industry, and engineering societies, to cooperate with MESA by offering volunteer time and other vital human and fiscal resources.

The MESA program begain in 1970 with 25 students at Oakland Technical High School. MESA has since expanded: in 1981-82, it served approximately 2,700 students from the 104 high schools involved in the program. There are currently 16 MESA centers throughout California, each center working with 4 to 13 senior high schools and serving from 80 to 400 students. In 1982-83, the program is serving 3,300 students at 131 high schools. Among the services provided to MESA students are tutoring; speakers; summer academic programs; parent meetings; incentive awards; academic and career counseling; recognition events; and field trips to industrial plants, research centers, universities, engineering firms, and computer centers.

The criteria used for selecting participants are:

1. Completion of Algebra I before the end of the 10th grade and enrollment in the next academic mathematics class;

2. Interest in a career that requires a year of calculus; and

3. Membership in a minority group underrepresented in mathematics and the related professions.

In order to remain in the MESA program, students must continue to enroll in college-preparatory mathematics, English and science courses, maintain an above-average grade point average, and participate in the MESA-sponsored activites.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Funding History

| 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $263,000 | $481,479 | $728,598 | $1,020,550 | $1,044,000 | $1,200,000 |

During fiscal year 1982-83, the MESA program was funded 15 percent by the Hewlett and Sloan Foundation, 25 percent by private industry, and 60 percent by the State General Fund.

Numbers Served

| 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 881 | 1,521 | 2,232 | 2,500 | 2,578 | 3,300 |

Evaluation Data

The MESA statewide office is gathering the data necessary to assess the impact of the program on the students served. Based on data provided by that office, of the 510 MESA high school graduates in June 1980, 82 percent enrolled in college and 57 percent began studies in a math-based discipline (engineering, life science, business administration/economics, computer science, and mathematics). Of the 662 June 1981 graduates, 89 percent enrolled in college and 69 percent chose math-based fields. Of the 748 MESA high school graduates in June 1982, over 90 percent indicated an intention to enroll in college and over 75 percent indicated they would major in a math-based field of study. An independent evaluation of MESA was completed in December, 1982, through funds provided by the Hewlett Foundation. Results of the study indicate that MESA is successfully contributing to the pool of minority students pursuing degrees in engineering and related fields. Among the evaluation's findings:

- MESA was perceived as effective by program coordinators, advisors, students, and parents.
- Data on academic performance indicated that MESA students performed significantly better than comparison groups of students having the same ethnic background.
- The eligibility rates for the University of California and the California State University were significantly higher among MESA students than other students with similar racial/ethnic backgrounds.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

QUEST FOR ENGINEERING, SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (QUEST)
A Minority Engineering Program

The mission of the QUEST Minority Engineering Program is to establish in California a cooperative secondary school and University effort aimed at increasing the number of engineering and math-based graduates from underrepresented minority groups.

The specific objectives of the program are to:

1. Establish a network of QUEST minority engineering program centers in California Engineering Schools;

2. Double the persistence rate of underrepresented minority students in engineering and computer science; and

3. Establish a program which integrates secondary school programs and university programs with the goal of producing B.S. degree graduates in Engineering and Computer Science.

The MESA (Mathematics, Engineering, Science Achievement) program began in 1970, at Oakland Technical High School with 25 students and has expanded to serve approximately 3,000 students in 100 high schools throughout the state of California. These efforts have increased the number of minority students entering California Engineering schools, however the retention of minority Engineering students is one half that for all students. The QUEST minority engineering program was started in school year 1982-83 to address this problem. By intervening to alter student related factors and institutional factors, QUEST will try to improve the rate of retention of these students. To be selected for the program, students must be from an underrepresented minority group, been accepted by a college or university, and working toward a Bachelor of Science Degree in Engineering or Computer Science.

Quest provides a number of services including:

1. Financial aid and scholarship assistance.

2. Freshman year transition support to familiarize the student with the campus and rigors of Engineering and Computer Science Programs.

3. Professional counseling to help the students deal with the special challenges for minorities participating in a field where they are, as yet, underrepresented.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

4. A student study center on each campus to provide academic support through peer group study, and individual counseling. Social support is also provided at the centers by affiliates of such groups as the National Society of Black Engineers (NSBE) and the Society of Hispanic Professional Engineers (SHPE).

## Funding History

Funds for the support of QUEST are from a variety of sources: University of California, California State University, foundations, industry, and the National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering. The estimated program funding for 1982-83, including in-kind contributions, is $1,390,000. In addition, each campus receives contributions from local industry for operating the program. State funding levels, including Minority Engineering Program (MEP) and Investment in People (IIP) funds, for projects at three different stages of operation are as follows:

FULLY OPERATIONAL PROGRAMS

| | MEP | IIP | TOTAL |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. U.C. Berkeley | $42,499 | $27,000 | $ 69,499 |
| 2. CSU, Los Angeles | 31,100 | 30,000 | 61,100 |
| 3. CSU Northridge | 53,200 | 53,100 | 106,300 |
| 4. San Diego State University | 30,000 | 25,000 | 55,000 |
| 5. San Jose State University | 27,200 | 25,000 | 52,200 |
| 6. USC ($40,000 private funding) | -- | -- | -- |
| PROGRAMS IMPLEMENTED 1982-83 | | | |
| 1. UCLA | 35,911 | 29,000 | 64,911 |
| 2. CSU Sacramento | 25,000 | 25,000 | 50,000 |
| 3. Cal Poly Pomona | 29,000 | 30,000 | 59,000 |
| PROGRAMS FUNDED MARCH 1983 | | | |
| 1. U.C. Davis | 40,000 | 19,000 | 59,000 |
| 2. U.C. Santa Barbara | 28,319 | 16,000 | 44,319 |
| 3. CSU, Fresno | 40,000 | -- | 40,000 |
| 4. CSU, Long Beach | 28,000 | -- | 28,000 |
| 5. Cal Poly San Luis Obispo | 28,784 | -- | 28,784 |
| | $410,229 | $279,000 | $689,329 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

These figures do not include funding for the statewide office operations or for private universities participating in MEP. MESA's total investment in the MEP at the postsecondary level is approximately $550,000.

## EVALUATION

Since the program was initiated in October 1982, impact data are not yet available. QUEST as part of the MESA statewide office, will gather data to assess the impact of the programs on retention and graduation rates.

### APPROXIMATE NUMBER OF STUDENTS TO BE SERVED, 1982-83

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| UC Berkeley | 150 | CSU Sacramento | 100 |
| CSU Los Angeles | 180 | Cal Poly Pomona | 200 |
| Ms. Evelyn Beaver | | | |
| CSU Northridge | 420 | UC Davis | 125 |
| San Diego State University | 100 | UC Santa Barbara | 125 |
| San Jose State University | 200 | CSU Fresno | 237 |
| USC | 315 | CSU Long Beach | 325 |
| UCLA | 210 | Cal Poly San Luis Obispo | 100 |
| | | | 2,787 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## SPECIAL PROGRAMS FOR DISADVANTAGED STUDENTS

Seventy-nine projects operated in California during the 1982-83 academic year through the federally funded "Special Programs for Students from Disadvantaged Backgrounds." These projects consist of four different program categories authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965. The four programs, listed chronologically by the length of time they have been in existence, are:

1. Upward Bound, established in 1966
2. Talent Search, established in 1966
3. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, established in 1970
4. Educational Opportunity Centers, established in 1974.

The following sections describe each of these program categories:

### California Upward Bound Projects

The Upward Bound program was originally established by the federal Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 to overcome deficiencies in secondary school counseling and to provide tutorial and enrichment programs. The program is designed to generate in low-income students and youth who would be the first generation of their families to attend college, the skills and motivation for success in education beyond high school. Students are served who have the potential to successfully complete postsecondary education but who, due to inadequate preparation and/or lack of motivation, cannot meet traditional admission requirements.

During 1982-83, 32 federally funded Upward Bound projects were in operation in California. Upward Bound projects attempt to develop the skills and motivation necessary for participants to gain admission into and complete successfully postsecondary education. Upward Bound projects, according to federal guidelines, may provide the following types of services:

1. Instruction in reading, writing, study skills, mathematics, and other subjects necessary for success beyond high school;
2. Personal counseling;



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Academic advice and assistance in high school course selection;

4. Tutorial services;

5. Exposure to cultural events, academic programs, and other activities not usually available to disadvantaged youth;

6. Activities designed to acquaint youths participating in the project with the range of career options available to them;

7. Instruction designed to prepare youths for careers in those areas in which minorities are particularly underrepresented;

8. On-campus residential programs; and

9. Programs and activities which are specially designed for students of limited English proficiency.

The federal guidelines require that the projects provide an assurance that program participants are individuals who are:

1. Citizens or nationals of the U.S. (or persons in the U.S. for other than temporary purposes and who intend to become permanent residents, or are residents of the trust territory of the Pacific Islands);

2. Between the ages of 14 and 27 (no age limits for veterans);

3. From low-income families;

4. From target areas or attending target schools;

5. Have completed at least the first year of secondary school but not entered the twelfth grade (except for veterans); and

6. Have academic potential but are unlikely to apply for admission or be accepted for enrollment in an institution of postsecondary education because of a lack of preparation or underachievement in high school.

## Funding

During 1982-83, 32 programs operated in California with a total federal budget of $5,306,602.

In addition to the grant awarded by the federal government, some projects apply for and receive the following types of supplemental income or resources: in-kind contributions by host agency or



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

campus, CETA funds for youth employment, the Summer Food Program (Department of Agriculture food program for low-income children), and in some instances, the Director's salary may be paid by the host campus.

During the 1982-83 academic year, the following locations and funding levels for each project are as follows:

| | 1982-83 Federal Grant |
|---|---|
| **Northern California** | |
| 1. California State University, Chico | $182,494 |
| 2. Humboldt State University | 171,523 |
| 3. California State University, Sacramento | 68,752 |
| 4. Humboldt State University (Veteran's) | 88,225 |
| 5. University of California, Davis | 153,167 |
| **Central Valley** | |
| 6. California State University, Fresno | $131,085 |
| 7. University of the Pacific (Stockton) | 133,645 |
| **Bay Area** | |
| 8. Mills College (Oakland) | $279,505 |
| 9. Peralta College (Oakland) | 72,871 |
| 10. City of Oakland (Projects to Assist Employment) | 132,505 |
| 11. California State University, San Francisco | 135,033 |
| 12. California State University, San Jose | 198,596 |
| 13. Stanford University (Palo Alto) | 121,465 |
| 14. University of California, Berkeley | 227,305 |
| 15. University of California, Berkeley (Upward Bound Ponapai) | 279,358 |
| 16. University of California, San Francisco | 232,939 |
| **Los Angeles Area** | |
| 17. California State University, Los Angeles | $111,041 |
| 18. California State University, Long Beach | 184,731 |
| 19. California State University, Northridge | 159,325 |
| 20. East Los Angeles College | 240,447 |
| 21. East Los Angeles College (Veteran's) | 92,880 |
| 22. Harvey Mudd College/Claremont College | 224,340 |
| 23. Occidental College | 199,220 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 24. | The Terrena Corp./School of Many Cultures (Oxnard) | 143,561 |
| 25. | California Lutheran College (Thousand Oaks) | 129,238 |
| 26. | University of California, Los Angeles | 186,059 |
| 27. | University of Southern California | 217,118 |
| 28. | Volunteers of America (Los Angeles) | 199,336 |

Southern California

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 29. | University of California, San Diego | $154,001 |
| 30. | San Diego Technical Institute (Veteran's) | 91,911 |
| 31. | California State College, San Bernardino | 171,165 |
| 32. | Imperial Valley College | 193,761 |

## Numbers Served

Upward Bound projects serve low-income, high-minority schools. While each project varies yearly on the number of students selected to participate, the number of participants usually range from 50 to 200 students.

## Evaluation Data

A final report on Upward Bound projects nationwide conducted by the Research Triangle Institute, entitled "Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program: A Second Follow-Up," concluded the following:

- Program impact is greatest on short-term outcomes (greater impact for 12th graders).
- Evidence indicates that Upward Bound is providing the skills, motivation, and assistance for entry into postsecondary education.
- It is less clear that the program provides the skills for success/retention in postsecondary education.
- Study results indicate an overall positive impact on Upward Bound participants on postsecondary education success.

## California Talent Search Projects

The Talent Search program is designed to provide pre-enrollment information and counseling service for disadvantaged youth.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Talent Search program is designed to:

1. Identify qualified low-income and disadvantaged youth, particularly those who would be in the first generation in their family to attend college, and who are not currently enrolled, with potential for education at the postsecondary level and to encourage such youth to complete secondary school and to undertake a program of postsecondary education;

2. Publicize the availability of student financial assistance available to persons who wish to pursue a program of postsecondary education; and

3. Encourage persons who have not completed programs of education at the secondary or postsecondary level, but who have the ability to complete such programs, to reenter educational programs, including postsecondary school programs.

A youth between the ages of 13 and 27 is eligible for Talent Search services if he/she:

1. Is a citizen or national of the U.S. (or in the U.S. for other than temporary purposes and intends to become a permanent resident, or is a resident of the trust territory of the Pacific Islands);

2. Has "exceptional potential" for success in postsecondary education or, in the case of a secondary or postsecondary school dropout, a "demonstrated aptitude" for reentry into and success in secondary or postsecondary educational programs;

3. Is of financial or cultural need;

4. Is in need of (a) guidance and counseling to complete or return to secondary school, (b) information and counseling on postsecondary educational opportunities, (c) assistance in gaining admission or readmission to postsecondary educational institutions, or (d) assistance in applying for financial aid to attend such institutions; and

5. Veterans if they are otherwise eligible may also receive services under this program.

The Talent Search program serves low-income students or those who would be the first generation in their family to attend college. Among the types of services are:

1. College admission and financial aid counseling,



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2. Placement services and tutoring,

3. Field trips to local colleges and universities,

4. Guidance counseling for high school and college dropouts,

5. Referral to other agencies and programs,

6. Parent advising,

7. Career counseling and testing,

8. Assistance with college forms,

9. Cultural activities,

10. Admissions status checks and advocacy, and

11. Assistance with high school course selection.

## Funding

During 1982-83, 10 Talent Search projects operated in California with an approximate federal budget of $1,239,990. The 10 California-based projects are sponsored by the following institutions:

| | 1982-83 Federal Grants |
|---|---|
| **Northern California** | |
| 1. College of the Redwoods (Eureka) | $108,378 |
| **Central Valley** | |
| No Projects | |
| **Bay Area** | |
| 2. Japanese Community Youth Council (S.F.) | $162,923 |
| 3. PACT, Inc., Educational Clearinghouse (S.F.) | 100,000 |
| 4. Stiles Hall/YMCA (Berkeley) | 199,126 |
| 5. United Council of Spanish Speaking Origin | 97,953 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Los Angeles Area

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 6. | California State University, Long Beach | $147,299 |
| 7. | California State University, Los Angeles | 102,658 |
| 8. | Volunteers of America (Los Angeles) | 82,993 |

Southern California

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 9. | Wahupa Educational Enterprises, Inc. (San Diego) | $170,051 |
| 10. | Imperial Valley Community College | 68,609 |

## Numbers Served

Talent Search projects are designed to serve a large number of clients and must fulfill program quota requirements. Generally, each project serves approximately 1,000 clients. However, some of the more established projects serve over 2,000 clients annually. Approximately 15,000 students are expected to be served in 1982-83 by the combined 10 projects.

## Evaluation/Impact Data

The federal government systematically gathers national data about Talent Search clients served via year-end reports submitted annually by the funded projects. The following data elements are collected: (1) number of clients served, (2) client distribution by ethnoracial background, (3) postsecondary placement, (4) types of postsecondary institutions attended, (5) number of clients prevented from dropping out in grades 7 through postsecondary, and (6) the number of clients who returned to school after having received Talent Search services.

## California Educational Opportunity Centers

The Educational Opportunity Centers (EOC) are established in areas with high concentrations of low-income disadvantaged adults. The purposes of this program are:

1. To provide federal support of up to 75 percent for the establishment of centers that will serve as clearinghouses for information concerning financial and academic support available at institutions of higher education.

2. To provide assistance to such low-income adults who are the first generation in their families to attend college.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. To provide counseling, tutorial, and other necessary services to students enrolled in such institutions.

4. To serve as recruiting and counseling pools to coordinate resources and staff efforts of postsecondary institutions in admitting educationally disadvantaged persons.

An Educational Opportunity Center may make its services available to all persons desiring to pursue a program of postsecondary education who reside within the geographical target area served by the Center. However, program participants must be citizens or nationals of the United States. Two-thirds of those served must be low-income, and one-third low-income or the first generation in their families to attend college.

There are currently two Educational Opportunity Centers in California. One is a rural outreach program sponsored by the Fresno County Mobile Guidance Educational Project, Inc. This project was created in 1969 as a Talent Search project, and became an Educational Opportunity Center in 1976 with a budget of approximately $200,000. The second project was established in Los Angeles in 1974-75 and is sponsored by the UCLA Extension Center.

## Funding

During 1982-83, funding levels for the two projects were:

| | 1982-83 Federal Grant |
|---|---|
| 1. Fresno County Mobile Education Guidance Project | $227,107 |
| 2. University of California, Los Angeles Extension | $400,180 |

The federal government provided up to 75 percent of the total funds for the EOCs. The Los Angeles-based project received additional in-kind contributions from the Los Angeles unified schools, Los Angeles Community Colleges, UCLA Extension Center, and community agencies. The Fresno project received additional funds from Fresno County and Kings County CETA programs, as well as in-kind contributions from Fresno, Kings, and Madera school districts.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Numbers Served

The Los Angeles-based EOC served approximately 4,000 people with 5 target high schools and 7 target Community Colleges. The Fresno project currently serves approximately 4,000 people, with 24 target high schools and 6 colleges and universities.

California Special Services for Disadvantaged Students

The Special Services for Disadvantaged Students program (SSDS) provides remedial and other special services to students who have academic potential but are hindered due to educational, cultural, economic, or physical handicaps.

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students provide the following types of services:

1. Remedial instruction that will enable students to complete required and prerequisite courses in a reasonable period of time;

2. Personal and career counseling;

3. Academic advice and assistance in course selection;

4. Tutorial services;

5. Exposure to cultural events and academic programs not usually available to disadvantaged students; and

6. Programs and activities specially designed for students of limited English proficiency.

Students are eligible to participate in a "Special Services" project if they are:

1. Enrolled or accepted at an institution which is the recipient of the project grant or contract;

2. A citizen or national of the U.S. (or in the U.S. for other than temporary purposes and intends to become a permanent resident, or is a resident of the trust territory of the Pacific Islands); and

3. (a) An individual with academic potential who demonstrates a need for the remedial and special services as a result of a deprived educational, cultural or economic background, or a



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

physical handicap, or (b) an individual with academic potential with a limited English-speaking ability who is in need of bilingual education, teaching, guidance, and counseling in order to successfully pursue postsecondary education. The above students must meet the low-income first generation or physically handicapped criteria.

Institutions receiving funds under this program must:

1. Obtain and provide adequate financial aid for students enrolled in the project to enable them to continue their academic program; and

2. Retain project participants at the institution for a period of time sufficient to enable them to adjust to and participate meaningfully in the academic program at the institution (a minimum of two years for a four-year program, one year for a two-year program).

3. At least two-thirds of the eligible individuals must be physically handicapped or low-income and first generation college students. The remaining one-third can be made up of any of the above.

## Funding

All 35 California-based projects are located on college and university campuses. The combined federal level for the 1982-83 programs was $3,378,206.

Many projects received additional funds and in-kind contributions from their sponsoring campus units since many are used to supplement and enhance existing campus programs.

The 35 California-based projects are located at the following sites with federal funding levels for 1982-83 is as follows:

### CALIFORNIA SPECIAL SERVICES

Northern California

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | Californis State University, Sacramento (P. Hand). | $ 97,852 |
| 2. | California State University, Sacramento | 91,712 |
| 3. | Humboldt State University | 107,875 |
| 4. | Sonoma State University, (Rohnert Park) | 125,302 |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Central Valley** | | |
| 5. | California State College, Stanislaus | $ 89,856 |
| 6. | California State University, Fresno | 90,854 |
| 7. | University of the Pacific (Stockton) | 84,675 |
| **San Francisco Bay Area** | | |
| 8. | California State University, Hayward | $152,659 |
| 9. | City College of San Francisco | 109,272 |
| 10. | Merritt College (Oakland) | 68,684 |
| 11. | Skyline College (San Bruno) | 128,385 |
| 12. | University of California, Berkeley | 86,014 |
| 13. | University of California, Berkeley | 156,542 |
| **South Bay Area** | | |
| 14. | San Jose State University | $141,031 |
| 15. | Monterey Peninsula College (Monterey) | 76,255 |
| **Los Angeles Area** | | |
| 16. | California State University, Los Angeles | $125,919 |
| 17. | Compton Community College | 123,644 |
| 18. | East Los Angeles College (Monterey Park) | 78,139 |
| 19. | East Los Angeles College | 114,607 |
| 20. | Rio Hondo College (Whittier) | 78,614 |
| 21. | University of California, Irvine | 125,607 |
| 22. | University of California, Riverside | 80,452 |
| 23. | University of Southern California (L.A.) | 101,498 |
| 24. | California State University, Long Beach | 185,342 |
| **Southern California** | | |
| 25. | San Diego State University | 73,450 |
| 26. | Cuyamaca College (El Cajon) | 34,682 |
| 27. | Grossmont College (El Cajon) | 34,682 |
| 28. | San Diego City College | 36,171 |
| 29. | San Diego Mesa College | 37,197 |
| 30. | Southwestern College (Chula Vista) | 36,246 |
| 31. | Palomar College (San Marcos) | 12,159 |
| 32. | University of California, Santa Barbara | 124,886 |
| 33. | California State College, San Bernardino | 125,635 |
| 34. | California State College, Bakersfield | 100,307 |
| 35. | Imperial Valley College | 141,993 |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Numbers Served

Projects estimate that approximately 10,000 students will be served in the 1982-83 academic year.

## Evaluation Data

The U.S. Department of Education contracted System Development Corporation in 1978 to conduct a comprehensive evaluation of SSDS projects. Preliminary results of the first phase of the study indicate that the more services students receive, the greater the improvement in academic performance and persistence in college. The final phase of the evaluation has tracked the target students for four years through graduation. The final report will be completed in Fall 1983.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT PROGRAMS

The Academic Enrichment Program (AEP) resulted from a special legislative initiative in the 1978-79 Budget Bill which recognized the critical need to involve University faculty in the effort to increase the enrollment of underrepresented groups in postsecondary education. Responding to this initative, MESA-like projects were developed for students who had been in the Partnership Program and were interested in majoring in areas other than mathematics, engineering, and the sciences. Four pilot projects were established and designed to include the participation of traditional outreach administrators, University faculty, secondary school counselors and teachers, professicnals from business and industry, community representatives, and parents. The pilot projects are located on the Irvine, Davis, Berkeley, and Santa Barbara campuses. The goals AEP are to assist students to achieve more than the minimal standards for regular University admission and to excel as University undergraudates.

The primary objective of this program is to provide academic enrichment and skill building activities for tenth and eleventh grade students who participated in the Partnership Program. While the four pilot projects differ in career focus, they share the following common goals:

1. To Augment Instruction in Required Coursework: Mathematics and English activities are geared to assist students in the mastery of these basic skills.

2. To Focus Aspirations In Higher Education: Knowledge of career opportunities as related to undergraduate education is essential in making informed choices about available college majors. AEP staff provide extensive career and educational counseling to students.

3. To Provide Information on How to Prepare for College: The projects strive to present complete and accurate information about admissions and financial aid policies and procedures at California's postsecondary institutions as well as information about career opportunities and options.

4. To Increase Motivation to Achieve: This component draws heavily on role models from the professional and academic circles geared to the program's field of focus.

Although each campus has responded differently in integrating the program into their institutional framework, the organization of each project includes the following basic structural components:



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Faculty Advisors: University faculty members who assume responsibility for the operation of the project, organize the advisory boards, and establish relationships with the scientific community and related industries, professionals, associations, and community organizations.

Coordinators: The day-to-day managers of the project. They work closely with AEP advisors at each secondary school and with the industrial, educational, and community groups who contribute resources to the project. The coordinators also arrange for tutoring, counseling, field trips, and other activities.

Advisory Boards: Composed of representatives from secondary schools, universities, industry, professional organizations, minority organizations, and other community groups. The Boards provide advice and counsel to AEP administrators.

Advisors: Usually high school faculty members. They assist in the selection of students who will participate in the project and direct all related activities at the high schools. The advisors maintain academic performance records of the students, coordinate field trips, and assist in career and academic counseling.

To be eligible to participate in the program, students must: (1) have previously participated in the Early Outreach Partnership Program, or be historcially underrepresented in AEP targeted academic disciplines; (2) earn at least a "C" grade in all subjects; (3) enroll in high-level college preparatory courses in mathematics, science, and English; (4) maintain a GPA of at least 2.5 in A to F courses; and (5) attend AEP study sessions and other program activities.

AEP schools are selected on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Significant numbers of Partnership Program students matriculating to the high school;

2. Active interest on the part of the school administration and faculty; and

3. Existence of strong programs in mathematics and English.

Each campus differs in career focus, type of services provided, and in the combination of University departments and administrative offices involved in sponsoring the programs. The following chart provides some descriptive information about each program.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Funding History

| 1978-79 | *1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $180,000 1/ | -0- | $192,000 | $192,000 | $192,000 |

1/ Four projects at $45,000 each during the start-up year.

*The funding provided in the 1978-79 Budget Act was not utilized during that fiscal year by the University for the establishment of the Academic Enrichment Program. The Legislature, therefore, carried the $180,000 appropriation forward to fiscal year 1979-80, without adding additional funding.

Numbers Served

There were 512 students served by the University's Academic Enrichment Program during the 1979-80 year. During 1980-81, 382 students were served at 25 high schools. In 1981-82, 576 students were served at 33 high schools.

Evaluation Data

In January 1981, the University of California published a report entitled "First Year Evaluation of the Academic Enrichment Program, 1979-80" which provides data about the number of students served during the first year. The report also includes a case study of the program at the Davis campus, which suggested that the program was having a positive impact on the students served. In February 1982, the University published data about the academic record in A-F courses for participants in the Academic Enrichment Program during 1980-81. These data indicate that more than 55 percent of the program participants on the Berkeley and Davis campuses maintained a 2.5 or better GPA. In contrast, on the Santa Barbara campus, 64 percent of the participants had less than a 2.5 GPA. Beyond these limited data, there is no basis upon which to judge the effectiveness of the Academic Enrichment Program.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## ACADEMIC ENRICHMENT PROJECTS

| Campus | Academic/ Career Focus | Services Provided | # of Students Served | # of High Schools Served |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Berkeley | Business administration/economics | Tutoring, counseling, field trips, summer programs, ongoing programs to stimulate interest in target careers--use of Learning Assistance Center facilities and resources. | 126 (79-80)<br>53 (80-81)<br>115 (81-82) | 7 (79-80)<br>9 (80-81)<br>11 (81-82) |
| Irvine | Writing, humanities/fine arts, computer science/ math | Monthly meetings, joint Partners/AEP summer institute, tutoring, faculty guest lectures and advising, parent meetings and participation in program activities. | 130 (79-80)<br>144 (80-81)<br>192 (81-82) | 5 (79-80)<br>9 (80-81)<br>10 (81-82) |
| Santa Barbara | Fine arts/humanities | Summer program and employment, enrichment courses in fine arts/ academic year program of: counseling, field trips, tutoring, incentive awards. | 83 (79-80)<br>72 (80-81)<br>170 (81-82) | 3 (79-80)<br>3 (80-81)<br>3 (81-82) |
| Davis | Computation/written communication skills | Academic advising, career counseling, academic tutorials, field trips, scholarship incentives. | 173 (79-80)<br>113 (80-81)<br>99 (81-82) | 4 (79-80)<br>4 (80-81)<br>9 (81-82) |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SUPPORT SERVICES

The University of California campuses offer a broad range of services for students who need help with their course work or with personal problems related to campus life. These services are used by a substantial proportion of the student body (as much as one-quarter on some campuses), and have become an integral part of the University's activities. Since 1976, the University has supplemented the academic support services available to students at large with additional or more intensive services for minority and low-income students.

The services offered vary somewhat among the campuses, but generally include four basic types of programs: (1) learning skills assistance, including small-group sessions and individual consultation on reading, wirting, and study skills such as time management, notetaking, and test preparation; (2) summer transitional programs, varying from week-long orientations to six or eight week academic programs; (3) advising and counseling sessions, including advising on careers and on graduate and professional schools; and (4) tutoring and instructional assistance.

The specific number of students using each service varies considerably, depending on the type of service. Because records are kept for each individual program separately, it is impossible on most campuses to determine an unduplicated count of the number of students using all services. The following is a brief summary.

BERKELEY: Most services are offered through the Student Learning Center, where 1,110 minority and low-income students participated in SAA-funded programs involving a summer bridge, a summer transfer program, supplemental tutoring, peer counseling and other learning center activities.

DAVIS: The SAA-funded programs at Davis work primarily with entering students, offering special basic skills courses in mathematics, and English, and intensive counseling for engineering students. Participation in all these programs has increased during the past two years, particularly in engineering counseling which served 215 students in 1981-82. There were 167 students in the mathematics program and 162 in the English programs. Davis also offers individual tutoring to EOP/SAA students, as a supplement to the campus' regular, group-tutoring program, with 163 students participating in 1981-82.

IRVINE: During 1981-82, between 555 and 635 students were served by each of Irvine's three major support service units: the Learn-



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ing Skills Center, Special Services, and the Tutorial Assistance Program. In addition, the Career Planning and Placement Center served 848 students.

LOS ANGELES: The Academic Advancement Program provided tutoring, counseling, and summer services to 2,903 students in 1981-82.

RIVERSIDE: Two hundred eighteen students participated in at least one service offered by the EOP/SAA unit, including fall orientation, a summer program, tutoring, and counseling. In addition, a mathematics program offered by the Learning Skills Center served 90 students.

SAN DIEGO: The Office of Academic Support and Instructional Services (OASIS) offers several services, including: (1) the Academic Success Program, with peer counseling and academic skills counseling; individual and small group tutoring; reading and study skills activities; and a writing program involving diagnostic testing, small group classes, and individual consultation. In 1981-82 OASIS served 1,224 students.

SANTA BARBARA: Two hundred three students participated in the Summer Transition Program in 1981-82: 629 were involved in tutoring and instructional groups: and 257 participated in Academic Internships.

SANTA CRUZ: The EOP/SAA unit served 429 students in its professional advising program, 298 in peer advising, 265 in tutoring, 597 in professional counseling, and 626 in peer counseling during 1981-82.

Funding History:

| 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|
| $1,014,000 | $1,266,000 | $1,472,000 | $1,406,000 |

Funding for Academic Support Services is derived from student fees and the State General Fund, with the General Fund paying 75 percent and educational fee revenues paying 25 percent.

Evaluation Data

Not all support services can be easily evaluated. The effects of counseling and advising, for instance, are very difficult, it not impossible to measure. The University systemwide office has published two annual reports (in January 1982 and January 1983) entitled "Academic Support Services for Minority and Low-Income Students at the University of California," which include data on

the effectiveness of some specific support service programs (the summer transition programs and the course-related workshops in mathematics and science.) Those available data indicate effectiveness in retaining minority and low-income students.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EARLY OUTREACH PROGRAM (PARTNERSHIP--JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL COMPONENT)

The University of California began its Partnership Program in 1976 to increase the number of junior high school students from underrepresented groups who are sufficiently informed about college, and motivated to attend, that they will enroll in college preparatory classes once they enter the ninth grade. Beginning in Fall 1981, the Legislature prescribed that the goal of this program is to increase the number of ethnic minorities who are eligible for admission to the University of California. In June 1982, the Legislature revised the goal for the this program to an increase in the number of low-income and/or ethnic minority students who are eligible to enroll in public four-year colleges, although students who are eligible may subsequently choose to attend another post-secondary institution.

In order to meet this goal, the program has been designed to provide the following services:

1. Academic Advising: individual and group sessions with both students and their parents, concentrating on University of California entrance requirements, college life, the importance of adequate academic preparation and the responsibility of the students to make the most of their educational opportunities. On some campuses, Saturday and summer classes or tutorial sessions are also held.

2. Role Model Presentations: meetings with local college faculty, students, community, and business leaders of underrepresented groups, who serve as role models as they make presentations to students, serve as hosts for field trips, and/or deliver program services such as counseling or tutoring.

3. College and University Visits: students and their parents visit campuses of the University of California, the California State University and Colleges, the Community Colleges, and independent institutions.

4. Dissemination of Printed Information: brochures and materials developed specifically for students and parents. These contain information on academic preparation, financial aid, college entrance examinations, and other topics.

5. Parent Meetings: information on financial aid and on the academic preparation necessary for admission to a college or university distributed to parents.

The Partnership Program is a cooperative effort between the University and junior high school campuses throughout California. Target schools are selected on the basis of the following five general criteria:

1. The level of minority student enrollment;

2. The willingness of school officials to participate in the program;

3. The extent to which students in these schools already receive services similar to those offered by the Partnership Program;

4. The extent to which students in the local high schools enroll in the University; and

5. The development of an appropriate ethnic mix of students participating in the program.

Based on available resources, expertise, school need, geographical and budgetary considerations, each campus program determines the extent of services it can offer to any given school. Schools which receive the full range of Partnership services are referred to as "full service" schools. Schools receiving less than the full range of services are categorized as "limited service" schools. Those receiving only printed materials are referred to as "information" schools. Overall, the Partnership Program serves over 250 junior high schools throughout the state.

While the criteria for student selection varies from campus to campus, the basic criteria for all participants include:

1. Enrollment in 7th, 8th, or 9th grade;

2. Ethnic minority and/or low-income background;

3. Potential to benefit from the Partnership Program and its activities;

4. Potential to achieve at a level which would result in University eligibility upon graduation from high school; and

5. Desire to participate in the program.

Participating students are expected to strive to meet three distinct objectives:

1. Successful completion of a college preparatory English course in the ninth grade;

2. Successful completion of first year algebra before entering the tenth grade; and

3. Development of an individual academic plan to be pursued in senior high school.

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EARLY OUTREACH PROGRAM (PARTNERSHIP--SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL COMPONENT)

The University of California started the senior high school component in 1979 to meet the needs of ninth, tenth, and eleventh grade students who have been involved with Partnership in junior high school. This component is designed to provide both direct academic support and assistance and continued informational and motivational services to those Partnership students who enroll in college preparatory courses upon entering high school. Students who do not take A to F courses are referred to programs more closely tailored to their needs and aspirations. Many of those who are on the "college-prep tract" and doing exceptionally well are also referred, but to more intensive programs such as MESA or one of the four Academic Enrichment Programs. The Partnership high school componnent seeks to retain and work directly with those students who have the potential to become eligible but whose attainment of eligibility to UC and/or CSU would be unlikely without the program's support.

The following expectations are made of students who participate in the program:

1. Completion of college-preparatory classes on a schedule which will allow for completion of the University's subject requirements before high school graduation;

2. Development of good study skills and habits, and active participation in program activities.

3. Maintenance of a level of academic achievement which will insure eligibility to enter a public four-year college.

The program basically offers the same five activities and services as the junior high component.

1. Academic advising

2. Role model presentation

3. College and university visits

4. Dissemination of printed information

5. Parent meetings

However, as the senior high school program is intended to assist students to complete rigorous academic programs successfully, increased emphasis is placed on tutoring and advising.

As in the junior high component, each campus selects participating schools from its geographical service area. Each of the eight campus programs is staffed with a full-time outreach officer, undergraduate and graduate student advisors, and tutors. Since the program aims to serve former Partnership students in the junior high, the school selection criteria are more narrowly defined. The basis for school selection is based on the following criteria:

1. The level of minority student enrollment;

2. The willingness of school officials to participate in the program;

3. The number of students who had participated in the Partnership Program;

4. The extent to which students in these schools already receive services similar to those offered by the Partnership Program;

5. The extent to which students in the local high schools enroll in the University; and

6. The development of an appropriate ethnic mix of students participating in the program.

The criteria used to select program participants vary from campus to campus. However, the common basic criteria for all participants include:

1. Enrollment in ninth, tenth, eleventh or twelfth grades;

2. Being a member of an underrepresented minority group, coming from a low-income background, or both;

3. Potential to benefit from the program and its activities;

4. Potential for admission to a four year postsecondary institution upon graduation from high school; and

5. Demonstrated desire to participate in the program.

## Funding History

| 1976-77 | 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $462,000 | $1,162,000 | $1,454,000 | $1,830,000 | $2,030,000 | $2,267,000 | $2,303,000 |

The University provided the financial support for this program during its initial two years. Beginning in 1977-78, support was

shared by the State General Fund (55%) and the University (45%). In 1980-81, the State provided 75 percent of the funding, with the University supporting the remainder. This funding pattern was continued through 1981-82.

## Numbers Served

The University reports that during 1980-81, it served 9,416 students through the junior high component and 7,470 students through the senior high component operating in 191 junior high schools and 140 high schools. In 1981-82, the junior high componenent was reduced to 8,203 students, while the senior high component was increased to 9,738 students, operating in 175 junior high schools and 162 senior high schools.

## Evaluation Data

During the past two years, the University has published impact data about participants in the Early Outreach Program. According to these data, 37.5 percent of the early outreach participants who graduated with the high school class of 1981 were eligible to enroll in the University, while 27.2 percent of the class of 1982 were eligible. Approximately 22 percent of the 1981 graduates and 18 percent of the 1982 graduates enrolled in the University. Data published by the University about the academic record in A-F courses of early outreach participants during the 1980-81 academic year indicate that more than 55 percent of these participants achieved a grade level at C+ or lower. Available data for the 1981-82 academic year are limited to 5 campuses. On three of these campuses, more than 55 percent of the program participants achieved a grade level at C+ or lower (the lowest level of academic achievement was at the Irvine campus, where more than 67 percent of the participants had a GPA at 2.5 or lower.) On two of the campuses, more than 50 percent of the participants achieved a grade level at 2.51 or above.)

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA IMMEDIATE OUTREACH PROGRAM

The final phase of the University's student affirmative action outreach effort is its recruitment component, Immediate Outreach. The principal goal of Immediate Outreach is to augment the number of applicants from regularly eligible underrepresented minority and low-income students, and to increase the number of these students who actually enroll in the University of California. The University began this program in 1976 as part of its initial Student Affirmative Action program. The specific program objectives, as stated by the University Systemwide staff, are:

1. To seek out and assist regularly qualified high school seniors and Community College students in making application to the University;

2. To assist former Early Outreach students in their application to the University;

3. To assist former Early Outreach students in their application to other postsecondary institutions;

4. To help track the academic progress of current and former early outreach students who enter the University and other postsecondary institutions.

While each of the nine UC campuses administers an Immediate Outreach program, each program varies in scope and in the type of services delivered. The administrative unit responsible for Immediate Outreach services also varies from campus to campus. These services may, for instance, be provided through the Educational Opportunity Program Student Affirmative Action and/or the Office of Relations with Schools.

While the specific types of services provided vary from campus to campus, they include high school visits, Community College visits, publications, transitional services upon enrollment, cultural activities, campus tours, freshman orientation sessions/seminars, tutoring, career information days, admissions counseling, college motivation nights, summer residential programs, and mini-information conferences and workshops.

All high schools within the campus service area participating in the Partnership Program receive the highest priority in Immediate Outreach services. Many other schools throughout the State are also targeted for services based upon high percentages of minority enrollment and demonstrated desire for services by counselors, parents and students.

## Funding History

| 1977-78 | 1978-79 | 1979-80 | 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $312,000 | $318,000 | $401,000 | $576,000 | $573,834 | $596,000 |

The University provided the financial support for this program during its initial two years. Beginning in 1977-78, support was shared by the State General Fund (55%) and the University (45%). In 1980-81, the State contributed 75 percent of the funding, and the University contributed 25 percent. This pattern was continued through 1982-83.

## Numbers Served

The Immediate Outreach program of the University of California provides services to most high schools and Community Colleges throughout California. Data are not available, however, about the total number of individuals or schools served through this program since it has not been possible to identify the unknown number of duplicated counts of students or schools served by immediate outreach efforts from more than one university campus.

## Evaluation

The University has the responsibility for evaluation of the Immediate Outreach program. At the present time, impact data are not available about clients served through this program.

## APPENDIX B

### Summary of Important Non-State Funded Outreach and Support Service Programs


| | Page |
|---|---|
| College Core Curriculum, Phineas Banning High School | 86 |
| The Cooperative College Preparatory Program (CCPP) | 88 |

## COLLEGE CORE CURRICULUM, PHINEAS BANNING HIGH SCHOOL

The College Core Curriculum (CCC) at Banning High School in Wilmington (in the Los Angeles harbor area) seeks to motiviate and prepare students who show potential for college but who lack the academic skills necessary for college success. The program was initiated by two college advisors and a teacher at Banning High in 1976. Banning is the fifth largest high school in the Los Angeles Unified School District, enrolling some 3,200 students, 85 percent of whom are minority.

The College Core Curriculum operates with no special funding. It represents a self-motivated comprehensive effort to improve the college performance and persistence of Banning graduates, and it illustrates what can be accomplished with existing resources at the local level to overcome some of the educaitonal barriers to college studies so characteristic of students from low socioeconomic backgrounds.

The program was initiated by the faculty and staff in response to feedback from Banning graduates who attended college and reported the following typical collegiate experiences: (1) needing to undertake remediation courses for academic survival and "catch-up," (2) being placed on academic probation, (3) having to change from math-and science-based majors to humanities, or (4) dropping out.

The College Core Curriculum is designed to identify potential college-bound students at Banning's feeder junior high schools, and upgrade the Banning High School curriculum through sequential learning in order to better prepare these students for college and the world of work.

The Program is essentially a school within a school, based on the University of California's A-F admission requirements. Students wishing to attend college enroll in the CCC program in the first year of high school and are placed in college preparatory English, mathematics, science, and foreign language classes. The philosophy of the program is based on the need to challenge and motivate students to achieve and maintain academic excellence thereby facilitating the success of students in college through:

1. changing both student and staff expectations and raising aspiration levels;

2. an academic curriculum that offers substantive integrated material promoting excellence through upgrading and standardizing course content; and



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. the establishment of a strong counseling and parental network.

Among the goals of the program are:

a. to raise the aspiration level of students and improve their self-concept;

b. to get as many students as possible to complete A-F pattern courses; and

c. to have more students receive college grants and scholarships.

A second predominantly minority school located in central Los Angeles implemented a College Core Curriculum in September 1980, based on the Banning model.

Funding History

The CCC Program operates without the use of direct outside funding. However, human and fiscal resources are utilized from the Academic Affairs Division at the University of California, Los Angeles in terms of student staff and faculty input. In addition, the program utilizes summer course offerings funded by MESA, and other outreach services provided by four-year colleges and universities.

Numbers Served

Approximately 800 students were enrolled in the Program at Banning High during the 1981-82 academic year, and 950 are enrolled during 1982-83.

Evaluation

In August 1982, the California Postsecondary Education Commission completed a study to assess the college experiences of College Core Curriculum graduates from Banning High.

The Commission study concluded that "available evidence concerning the high school performance of program participants indicates that the program has been successful in achieving at least some of its objectives and that it is worthy of observation by other secondary schools thoughout the State." An example of this success is the fact that the first graduating class of the College Core Curriculum took considerably more A through F semester courses required for admission by the University of California, particularly in mathematics and English, than their 1976 college-bound counterparts.

## THE COOPERATIVE COLLEGE PREPARATORY PROGRAM (CCPP)

The Cooperative College Preparatory Program is a long-range effort of the University of California, Berkeley and the Oakland School District to strengthen the District's secondary school math programs and the District's capacity to prepare minority students for college. As part of a major District initiative to revitalize the Oakland schools, CCPP provides (1) inservice training and professional development for teachers, counselors, and administrators; (2) assistance and training for teachers, counselors, administrators, and parents in planning, implementing, and managing the educational change process; and (3) instructional support to help students make the transition to more rigorous courses taught to higher standards. These services are provided over a five-year period during which the numbers of students taking the college preparatory math sequence through pre-calculus is gradually increased and the capacity of the schools to maintain a strenghthened program is developed.

CCPP was introduced in the summer of 1980 as a pilot project at Oakland's Castlemont High School and two of its feeder junior high schools. It expanded in 1981-82 to include Fremont High School and all six junior high schools which send students to Castlemont and Fremont. A further expansion in 1982-83 includes Oakland Technical High and its two junior high schools. These schools represent 50 percent of the District's secondary schools.

CCPP provides a wide range of assistance in all areas of school operation according to the needs of particular schools. CCPP staff work with teachers, counselors, and administrators on a daily basis at the school site to: (1) strengthen curriculum and instruction in the college preparatory math courses, grades 7-12; (2) develop methods of identifying talented students in grades 6-9; (3) improve management, counseling, and enrollment practices; (4) coordinate school programs; (5) provide instructional support for students in class and in study groups; (6) develop school peer teaching, peer tutoring, and peer counseling programs; and (7) develop methods for building and sustaining parent involvement. Assistance at individual schools is complemented by a School-University Institute at which school faculty and staff, District staff, parents, and Univeristy staff meet regularly to identify problems, to plan solutions, and to share information and successful practices. CCPP staff assist in the follow-up work required to implement plans formed at the Institute and assist teachers to introduce curriculum ideas and instructional techniques into particular classes.

Funding History

Funding in 1980-81 was provided by the University of California, Berkeley ($190,500). Funding in 1981-82 was provided by the University of California, Berkeley ($263,500) and the San Francisco Foundation ($36,500). Funding in 1982-83 is provided by the University of California, Berkeley ($245,000), the San Francisco Foundation ($63,500), the Bechtel Corporation (10,000), and the Oakland Public Schools ($36,000).

| 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|
| $190,500 | $300,000 | $354,500 |

Numbers Served

| 1980-81 | 1981-82 | 1982-83 |
|---|---|---|
| 350 students | 985 students | (approx.) 1,310 students |
| 20 teachers | 51 teachers | 63 teachers |
| 25 administrators and counselors | 44 administrators and counselors | 62 administrators and counselors |

Evaluation

The program's success will be measured in part by the following criteria:

1. the degree of increased enrollment in the college preparatory sequence beginning in grade 7 and ending with pre-calculus in grade 12;

2. the degree of improved performance in these courses;

3. the degree of improved achievement on tests and college entrance exam scores;

4. increases in the number of minority students who enter four-year colleges and graduate, especially in majors requiring strong math backgrounds.

Preliminary data indicate student enrollment at each level of the college preparatory math sequence through pre-calculus has more than doubled. More complete impact data based on the above criteria are expected to be available starting in 1984.